906
VIR
1882

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

Virginia Historical Society,

WITH THE ADDRESS OF

WILLIAM WIRT HENRY

ON THE

EARLY SETTLEMENT OF VIRGINIA,

FEBRUARY 24, 1882.

ERRATUM.

In the first and second lines of the Address, p. 10, instead of the words, "*16th June, 1621,*" read "*3d February, 1620.*"

THE LIBRARY OF THE
JUL 25 1926
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

Virginia Historical Society

AT THE

Annual Meeting, February 24, 1882,

WITH

THE ADDRESS

OF

WILLIAM WIRT HENRY:

THE SETTLEMENT AT JAMESTOWN, WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO THE LATE ATTACKS UPON CAPTAIN JOHN SMITH, POCAHONTAS, AND JOHN ROLFE.

RICHMOND, VIRGINIA.
PUBLISHED BY THE SOCIETY.
MDCCCLXXXII.

WM. ELLIS JONES,
PRINTER,
RICHMOND, VA.

906
VIR
1882

ORGANIZATION

OF THE

Virginia Historical Society.

1882.

President.

ALEXANDER H. H. STUART, *of Staunton, Virginia.*

Vice-Presidents.

CONWAY ROBINSON, *of Washington, D. C.*
WILLIAM W. CORCORAN, *of Washington, D. C.*
WILLIAM WIRT HENRY, *of Richmond, Virginia.*

Corresponding Secretary and Librarian.

R. A. BROCK, *of Richmond, Virginia*

Recording Secretary.

GEORGE A. BARKSDALE, *of Richmond, Virginia.*

Treasurer.

ROBERT T. BROOKE, *of Richmond, Virginia.*

Executive Committee.

BEVERLEY RANDOLPH WELLFORD, JR.. *of Richmond, Virginia.*
ANTHONY M. KEILEY..... *of Richmond, Virginia.*
J. L. M. CURRY..... *of Richmond, Virginia.*
HENRY COALTER CABELL..... *of Richmond, Virginia.*
ARCHER ANDERSON..... *of Richmond, Virginia.*
WILLIAM P. PALMER..... *of Richmond, Virginia.*
CHARLES GORHAM BARNEY..... *of Richmond, Virginia.*
JOSEPH BRYAN..... *of Richmond, Virginia.*
EDWARD VIRGINIUS VALENTINE..... *of Richmond, Virginia.*
JOHN OTT..... *of Richmond, Virginia.*
WILLIAM A. MAURY..... *of Washington, D. C.*
JOHN B. WHITEHEAD..... *of Norfolk, Virginia.*

Members of the Committee ex-officio:

The President, Vice-Presidents, Secretaries and Treasurer.

54213

Committee on Finance.

WILLIAM P. PALMER, BEVERLEY R. WELLFORD, JR.,
WILLIAM WIRT HENRY.

Committee on Publication.

ARCHER ANDERSON, EDWARD VIRGINIUS VALENTINE,
J. L. M. CURRY.

Committee on the Library.

ANTHONY M. KEILEY, JOSEPH BRYAN,
WILLIAM P. PALMER.

Committee on Incidental Expenses.

HENRY COALTER CABELL, EDWARD VIRGINIUS VALENTINE,
BEVERLEY R. WELLFORD, JR.

Committee on Membership.

WILLIAM WIRT HENRY, CHARLES GORHAM BARNEY,
JOHN OTT.

Committee on Building.

JOHN OTT, R. A. BROCK,
HENRY COALTER CABELL.

PROCEEDINGS.

The Annual Meeting of the Virginia Historical Society was held in the Hall of the House of Delegates of Virginia, in the Capitol at Richmond, Friday, February 24th, 1882, at 8 o'clock in the evening.

The meeting was called to order by Vice-President Henry, and the Hon. Beverley Randolph Wellford, Jr., requested to preside.

The Corresponding Secretary and Librarian, R. A. Brock, in behalf of the Executive Committee, read the report of that body. He also read the report of the Treasurer.

Mr. James Lyons, Jr., for the nominating committee, reported a list of officers and committees for the year 1882. They were unanimously chosen.

Vice-President Henry then addressed the Society.

At the close of the address the Hon. Anthony M. Keiley offered the following resolution, which was unanimously adopted:

Resolved, That the thanks of the Society be presented to Vice President Henry for his learned, able and instructive address, a copy of which is hereby requested for publication with the proceedings of the Society on this occasion.

REPORT

OF THE

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

We have just cause to congratulate the Society upon the highly encouraging progress it has made during the past year, both in membership and material acquisitions.

It is worthy of remark also, that the interest which has been manifested in its welfare has not only pervaded our whole country, but has extended across the Atlantic, and we have had gratifying demonstrations that the descent of the "Ancient Dominion," after a lapse of nearly three centuries, is still warmly regarded in the Mother Country.

We have the great pleasure to report that the Society now bears upon its rolls an aggregate membership of 592, which comprises 30 honorary, 63 corresponding, 52 life, and 447 annual members. Of the last named class, the whole number may be said to have been acquired since February 1, 1881, as, for several years prior to that time, the Society being unable to offer a publication as an equivalent, no subscription had been asked of such members, and no obligation rested upon them.

The additions during the past year in the remaining classes have been: 17 life, 13 corresponding, and 7 honorary members.

During the same period, the Society has added by gift to its library and collections: 171 bound volumes, 304 pamphlets, a number of files of newspapers, bound and unbound, many valuable MSS. and autograph letters of distinguished persons, and various memorials and objects of interest.

The most important single acquisition was the generous gift of the Hon. W. W. Corcoran, (a Vice-President of the Society), of the *Original MS. Records or Entry Books of the Colony of Virginia for the five years (1752–1757) of the administration of Lieutenant-Governor Robert Dinwiddie.*

Among other gifts of significance and value may be mentioned the following:

The writing-table of George Mason of "Gunston," upon which he prepared the famous Bill of Rights of Virginia—presented by his great-grand-son, George Mason, Esq., Alexandria, Va.

The original commission (dated April 4, 1707,) of Robert Hunter, (who being captured by the French on his voyage from England, never served as designed) as Lieutenant-Governor of Virginia—presented by Charles P. Greenough, Esq., Boston, Mass.

Two maps of Virginia, bearing date 1671; *Notes on Columbus*, a privately printed and sumptuous volume; 21 bound volumes of the New York *World*, 1861–1867 inclusive—presented by S. L. M. Barlow, Esq., New York City.

The Correspondence of the Hon. Archibald Stuart, comprising letters from many of the most eminent American statesmen of his day; the sword of Major Alexander Stuart, a patriot of the Revolution, used by him at the battle of Guilford Court House—presented by the Hon. Alex'r H. H. Stuart (the President of the Society), Staunton, Va.

The Adams and Massie family papers, a most valuable and interesting collection, commencing in the year 1670; The pistols and sash of a British officer, captured during the Revolution, and afterwards used by Major Thomas Massie of the 2d Va. regiment—presented by Mrs. Elizabeth, relict of the late Col. Thos. J. Massie, Nelson Co., Va.

Various family papers and relics—presented by Colonel Thos. Harding Ellis, late of Richmond, now of Chicago, Illinois.

An original Fry and Jefferson's Map of Virginia, of 1775—presented by the Hon. Robert W. Hughes, LL. D., Norfolk, Va.

A copy of Stuart's Indian Wars of Virginia in 1774, in the autograph of Colonel Thomas Lewis—presented by Col. John L. Eubank, Warm Springs, Bath Co., Va.

Various volumes from the library of Richard Henry Lee, bearing his autograph—presented by Cassius F. Lee, Jr., Esq., Alexandria, Va.

Six volumes of the *National Intelligencer*, covering the period June 6, 1848—May 28, 1857; Report of the Revisors of the Civil Code of Virginia, made to the General Assembly in 1846 and 1847—interleaved and annotated—presented by Col. J. Marshall McCue, Afton, Va.

Four large boxes of newspapers and pamphlets—presented by Mrs. W. B. Caldwell, White Sulphur Springs, West Virginia.

Three large boxes of newspapers and pamphlets—presented by Mrs. M. A. Sitlington, Millboro' Springs, Va.

The MS. Order-book of Col. Wm. Heth of the Revolution, whilst encamped at Bound Brook, New Jersey, in 1777—pre-

sented by the Rev. Philip Slaughter, D. D., Mitchell's Station, Culpeper Co., Va.

Did not the limits of the present occasion forbid it, we would have pleasure in rendering specific acknowledgment for many additional memorials of value and interest.

The correspondence of the Society, and other duties incident upon its reorganization, during the past few months, have been so onerous, that the preparation of a catalogue of its library has not as yet been within the accomplishment of the incumbent of the combined offices of Corresponding Secretary and Librarian.

The number of bound volumes, however, may be stated as exceeding 11,000, to which may be added several thousand pamphlets. The Society's collection of portraits, twenty-eight in number, comprises the following subjects: Pocahontas (two of), Earl of Essex, Captain George Percy, Lord Culpeper, George Washington, Martha Washington, Patrick Henry, Peyton Randolph, George Mason, Thomas Jefferson, Lafayette, Arthur Lee, Edmund Pendleton, John Marshall, Duke de Lauzun, Gerard, John Randolph of Roanoke, Hugh Nelson, Commodore Oliver H. Perry, Governor Wm. B. Giles, Black Hawk, and Rev. M. D. Hoge, D. D. The walls of the Westmoreland Club-House, in which the Society is generously allowed its present quarters, are hung with many additional objects of interest—engraved portraits, relics, historic documents, etc., the property of the Society. The MSS. and autograph letters of the Society are now in course of arrangement, the last in scrap-books. Until the task may be completed, the definite number cannot be stated, but it is thought to exceed 2,000.

The library is duly provided with handsome cases, and the exhibit is one alike creditable to the Society and to the State. So inestimably valuable indeed is it—so essential in the elucidation of the history of Virginia, and in vindication of her fame, and so irreparable would be its loss, that it is a duty from which we must not shrink, to plead with this assembly its claims to a durable repository, and due provision for its safety against all accident. This can only be assured in the possession by the Society of a fire-proof building of its own. Who, among the

pecuniarily favored of our citizens, will move in this important matter?

We beg to announce, that in pursuance of one of the offices of the Society, an important contribution to history—The Letter-Books of Lieutenant-Governor Alexander Spotswood, covering the term of his colonial administration in Virginia (1710–1722), a marked period in the development of the resources and manufactures of the colony, and of its progress—is in course of preparation, and that it is contemplated that the first volume of the work will be ready for delivery to the members of the Society by the first of May next.

The evidences which the present recital give of the condition of the Society, together with the knowledge of its recent unexampled progress (of which our citizens have been regularly advised through the generous medium of the local press), are assurances of fruition in its noble mission, which should claim for it all needful sustenance from our own people of Virginia, and this, it is to be hoped, will in the future be cheerfully accorded.

THE ADDRESS.

In a speech delivered by Lord Chancellor Bacon on the 16th June, 1621, in reply to the Speaker's oration, that celebrated man gave utterance to these words: "This Kingdom, now first in his Majesty's times, hath gotten a lot or portion in the New World by the plantation of Virginia and the Summer Islands. And certain it is with the kingdoms on earth, as it is in the Kingdom of Heaven, sometimes a grain of mustard seed proves a great tree. Who can tell?" What that great man hoped for and hesitated to foretell has been realized in a manner far beyond the most glowing conception of his wonderful genius. The little English colony planted at Jamestown in 1607 proved to be the germ of a great people. Less than three centuries have passed by and they occupy a vast continent, and number more than fifty millions. Had that feeble colony perished, as did those previously sent out from England, the Spaniards, who claimed by right of discovery by Columbus in 1492, and by grant from Pope Alexander VI, in 1493, and who were already planted in Florida and Mexico, would have controlled the colonization of North America, as they did that of South America, and to-day North and South America would alike present the wretched appearance of a mongrel population, the admixture of three races—Spanish, Indian, and African. In a word, North America would have been Mexicanized.

But an overruling Providence ordered it otherwise, and North America, through the Virginia settlement, was secured to the English race and to English civilization.

If the importance of an event is measured by the consequences which flow from it, then the planting of the English colony at Jamestown must be considered one of the most important, if not the most important, of the events which have been recorded in secular history. Not only followed from it the possession of this vast and fertile continent by the foremost race of the earth, resulting in a people who have secured to themselves the highest

development and greatest political freedom, and have reacted with powerful effect upon the civilization and institutions of the Old World, but from this beginning there was developed a system of colonization which has made the people of the little isles of Great Britain the greatest power of the earth—the greatest power which has ever been upon the earth, "a power [in the eloquent words of Webster] which has dotted over the surface of the whole globe with her possessions and military posts, whose morning drum-beat, following the sun, and keeping company with the hours, circles the earth with one continuous and unbroken strain of the martial airs of England."

Since the world has been so wonderfully affected by the planting of this colony, it well becomes us to preserve with religious care the memory of the men to whom we are indebted for its success.

The London Company which sent it out was composed of the best and most honored men of the kingdom, and among the men who composed the colony are names conspicuous for intellect and public services; but the names oftenest mentioned in connection with the Virginia settlement, and which have excited the greatest interest, are those of Captain John Smith, the preserver of the colony, and Pocahontas, the preserver of Smith, and the constant friend of the English. For more than two hundred and fifty years historians have delighted to relate their services, often quoting the quaint, terse language of Smith's History in giving his adventures, and especially his rescue from death by Powhatan's "dearest daughter," at the risk of her own life, when as her father's prisoner he was condemned to die.

In all that time no one discredited Smith's account of the colony, if we except Thomas Fuller, whose groundless sneer at Smith in his "Worthies of England," only demonstrated his ignorance of the sources from which Smith drew the material for his history.

Thus the matter stood till the year 1860, when Mr. Charles Deane, of Massachusetts, edited with notes, for the American Antiquarian Society, of which he was a member, "A Discourse of Virginia, by Edward Maria Wingfield, the first president of the Colony," which was then first published from the original manuscript in the Lambeth Library. This tract is found in vol. iv of the "Archælogia Americana." In one of his notes to this publication Mr. Deane suggested a doubt as to the truth of

Smith's account of his rescue by Pocahontas. In 1866, Mr. Deane edited with notes a reprint of "A True Relation of Virginia, by Captain John Smith," and renewed his attack on Smith's veracity. During the next year Mr. Henry Adams followed up the attack by an elaborate article, contributed to the January number of the *North American Review*. In the year 1869 the Rev. Edward D. Neill published a "History of the Virginia Company of London," in which he not only endeavored to destroy the character of Smith, but that of Pocahontas, and of her husband, John Rolfe, as well. This author has been followed by Wm. Cullen Bryant and Sydney Howard Gay in their History of America, published in 1876, and by others.

So persistent have these assaults been that it seems to be the fashion now with those writers who are content to act the part of copyists, to sneer at the veracity of Smith, the virtue of Pocahontas, and the honesty of Rolfe. The more generous task of making their defence shall be mine.

In order that there may be a better understanding of the discussion proposed it may be proper to recall certain well-attested facts relating to the early colonial history of Virginia.

The colony which made the first permanent settlement was sent from England by "The Virginia Company of London," to whom had been given the rights of colonization previously granted to Sir Walter Raleigh by Queen Elizabeth. Sir Walter had planted a colony at Roanoke Island, on the coast of North Carolina, but it had perished, and his further efforts had been thwarted. The London Company, during the year 1606, fitted out their expedition in three vessels. The Sarah Constant, in charge of Captain Christopher Newport, the commander of the expedition, carried seventy-one men; the Godspeed, in charge of Captain Bartholomew Gosnold, carried fifty-two men; and the Discovery, a pinnace, in charge of Captain John Ratcliffe, carried twenty men. Leaving the Thames on 19th December, 1606, they were detained in the Downs by bad weather till the 1st January, 1607. On the 26th of April following they were driven by a storm into the Chesapeake Bay,* and on the 13th of May they

* The Indians had informed the English at Roanoke Island of this bay, and it had been determined by Raleigh to attempt a settlement on it. When the Virginia Company sent out this colony they were directed to search for it. It

landed at Jamestown, where they determined to settle. Upon opening their sealed instructions they found that the London Company had appointed for their government a council, composed of Edward Maria Wingfield, Bartholomew Gosnold, John Smith, Christopher Newport, John Ratcliffe, John Martin, and John Kendall. They chose Wingfield to be president. Captain John Smith had been charged during the voyage with fostering a mutiny, and was under arrest when they landed. His innocence was made manifest, or, at any rate, his accusers failed to convict him, and on the 10th June he was permitted to take his seat in the council. After exploring the James river to its falls, Captain Newport sailed for England, on the 22d of June, to bring additional colonists and supplies, and he arrived at Jamestown on his return on the 8th January, 1608. He found that matters had not gone well during his absence. Want of suitable food, and a climate to which the men were unaccustomed, had caused much sickness and death. Among the council Captain Gosnold was dead, and Wingfield and Kendall had been deposed, and were under arrest upon serious charges. The difficulties through which the colony had passed had developed the fact, however, that there was one man among them of genius equal to the enterprise. That man was Captain John Smith. He had commenced exploring the country and trading with the Indians for corn, by which he supplied all the wants of the colony, and three times he had prevented their abandonment of the settlement in the pinnace, which Newport had left behind. During one of his expeditions up the Chickahominy some of his men had been killed, and he captured, but by address he had procured his release, and been sent back with an escort to Jamestown, where he arrived the day of Newport's return. Newport found him, however, in great peril; for Gabriel Archer, Smith's enemy, who had been improperly made a councillor during his captivity, on his return had caused him to be arrested and tried upon the charge of being accessory to the murder of the two men he had with him when he was captured by the Indians. Upon this pretext he was condemned to die, but the arrival of Newport saved him. When Newport sailed again for England,

---

had been demonstrated that the bad harbor at Roanoke Island rendered that place unfit for a settlement.

on the 10th of April following, he carried with him both Wingfield and Archer. And, upon his arrival in England, Wingfield wrote a defence of his administration, which is known as "Wingfield's Discourse of Virginia." The Phœnix, commanded by Captain Nelson, arrived after Newport's departure, having been separated from him on the voyage from England. This vessel returned to England on the 2d June, 1608, and carried a letter written by Smith to a friend, relating what had happened in the colony. This letter, as published in 1608, is known as "Smith's True Relation," or, "Newes from Virginia."

Smith continued his explorations and trade, and with the assistance of Pocahontas, who exerted a great influence over her father, kept the colony well supplied with provisions. On the 10th of September, 1608, he accepted the presidency, which office he filled with great credit. His adventures among the Indians, as related by his companions, were very remarkable, and he inspired the Savages with a wholesome fear of himself, which proved of great advantage to the infant colony. Pocahontas was his fast friend, and saved the English on more than one occasion, not only by supplying their wants, but by informing Smith of the plots of the Indians against them. During the fall of 1608 Newport brought a second supply of colonists, and on his return to England carried a map of the country and a description of the inhabitants, prepared by Captain Smith, which were published in 1612 at Oxford. The returns from the colony had not been profitable, and a change of charter was obtained on 23d May, 1609. By its provisions the government was no longer vested in a president and council, but in a governor, to be appointed by the London Company. Sir Thomas West, Lord Delaware, was appointed governor, and he sent Sir Thomas Gates as his Lieutenant, to reside in the colony. In October, 1609, Smith sailed for England, and never returned. He left the colony at the close of his presidency in a hopeful condition. It consisted of upwards of four hundred and ninety persons seated at Jamestown, and several other places. They had twenty-four pieces of ordnance, and three hundred stand of small arms, with sufficient ammunition, three ships and seven boats, a store of commodities to trade with the natives, the harvest newly gathered, ten weeks provisions in store, six hundred swine, with some goats and sheep, and many domestic fowls. They had become well

acquainted with the natives, their language and habitations, and could muster, if need be, one hundred well trained soldiers.* Everything looked to a permanent and successful colony. But the departure of Smith changed the whole aspect of affairs. The Indians at once became hostile, and killed all that came in their way. The ships were lost, the provisions were wasted, and a famine set in, accompanied by the diseases which invariably attend it. Within six months after Captain Smith left them, there were not over sixty alive, and these could hardly hope to live ten days longer. Sir Thomas Gates had been shipwrecked in coming over, and had remained at the Bermudas to refit. When he arrived at Jamestown he beheld the ghastly spectacle of a dying colony. He abandoned all hope of reviving it, and taking the survivors aboard he set sail for England. Before they got out of the river, however, they were met by Lord Delaware, who had determined to visit the colony himself, and had brought three ships well provisioned. He carried the remnant of the colony back to Jamestown, and by his wise administration put new life into the enterprise, the practicability of which had been demonstrated by Captain Smith.

After Smith's departure Pocahontas refused to visit Jamestown, but continued to show kindness to the English who fell into her father's hands. In 1613 Captain Argall induced her to visit his ship at anchor in the Potomac, made her a prisoner and carried her to Jamestown. In 1614 she became a Christian, and was married to John Rolfe, one of the colonists. Her marriage brought peace with the Indians. Sir Thomas Dale, who was

* This statement of the condition of the colony is taken from the Oxford Tract, compiled from the writings of Smith's companions; and from Purchas' Pilgrims. vol. iv, p. 1731, where it is taken from the same writers. It has been disputed chiefly upon the statements of the Virginia Assembly in 1624, styled "A Briefe Declaration of the plantation of Virginia during the first 12 years, &c," vol. i of Colonial Records of Virginia. This paper states (p. 70) that the men landed by Sir Thomas Gates fell upon the seven acres of corn planted, "and in three days, at the most, wholly devoured it." Doubtless the words, "the harvest newly gathered," used at a later date, referred to the harvest of the Indians, for which there were ample commodities to trade.

Raleigh Crashaw was a member of the Assembly of 1624, and he endorsed Smith's History of Virginia, which copies this statement from the Oxford Tract. The account of suffering afterwards carried to England by the Swallow, referred to what happened after Smith left the colony.

acting as governor, carried her with her husband and child to England in 1616, where she was handsomely entertained by the London Company and others, the queen and her court paying her marked attention. As she was about to return to Virginia she was taken sick, and died at Gravesend on the 21st of March, 1617.

The grounds of Mr. Deane's attack on Smith's veracity may be briefly stated as follows: Smith came to Virginia in 1607 and returned to England in 1609. Accounts of what happened during his stay in the colony were written by himself and others, and many publications concerning the early history of the colony were made, but no mention was made in any publication of Smith's rescue by Pocahontas, as is claimed, till 1622, when Smith published a second edition of a tract entitled "New England Trials," which contains an allusion to it; and it was only in Smith's "General History of Virginia," published in 1624, that the full details were given. It is charged that the prominence to which Pocahontas had attained in 1616 induced Smith to invent the story, in order that he might associate her name with his own. Mr. Deane also claimed that the account of Smith's treatment at the hands of the Indians while their prisoner, given at the time in his letter known as the "True Relation," differs materially from that given in the "General History," and that all the later accounts given by Smith of his early adventures show considerable embellishment, and are unworthy of belief.

Those who have followed in the wake of Mr. Deane have endeavored to point out many inconsistencies between the accounts given by Smith in his different publications relating to the same matters, and he has been painted by one at least, (Mr. Neill,) as a braggart and a beggar, and unworthy of belief generally.

It is proposed to examine these several grounds of attack in detail, and to show that in no instance has a falsehood been fixed on Smith, but that his writings, where they have been disputed, are so fully sustained that they constrain our belief.

The first ground of attack is the alleged omission of all allusion to Smith's rescue in his early writings and those of his contemporaries. If this be shown, and cannot be properly explained, it will beyond doubt give rise to a painful suspicion as to the truth of the subsequent account, given after Pocahontas had become an object of public interest. But it will only raise doubt

as to Smith's veracity. A mere failure of the early writers to mention the incident does not amount to proof that it never occurred. If, however, the silence of these earlier publications can be satisfactorily explained then the attack based upon it utterly fails.

The books which relate to the early history of the colony, and which it is claimed should have noticed the rescue, are—

1. "A True Relation of Virginia," or "Newes from Virginia," the letter written by Captain John Smith, and published in London 1608.

2. "A Discourse of Virginia," written by Edward Maria Wingfield, the first president, and printed first in 1860.

3. "Historie of Travaile into Virginia," by Wm. Strachey, secretary of the colony from 1610 to 1612, printed first in 1849.

4. "The proceedings of the English colonie in Virginia since their first beginning from England in the yeere of our Lord 1606," printed at Oxford 1612, and known as the second or historical part of the "Oxford Tract," Smith's map and description of the country being the first part.

5. "Purchas' Pilgrimage," by the Rev. Samuel Purchas, printed in 1613, and republished in 1614, 1617, and 1626.

6. "A True Discourse of the present estate of Virginia," &c., by Ralph Hamor, late secretary in the colony, printed in 1615.

As the first of these publications was written by Captain Smith himself, and gives an account of his captivity among the Indians, its failure to record his rescue by Pocahontas is considered the strongest evidence of the falsity of the account given by him years afterwards. Indeed the force of the attack upon Smith, inaugurated by Mr. Deane, will be found in this alleged omission. But what are we to think of the argument when we learn, what is undoubtedly true, that this letter has never been published as Smith wrote it. Parts of it were suppressed by the person who published it, who, in a preface signed with his initials "J. H.," states that fact, and this preface was republished by Mr. Deane in 1866, along with the garbled letter. The preface gives an account of how the publisher came by the manuscript, and of a mistake in printing some of the copies under the name of Thomas Watson instead of Captain Smith, the true writer, and then these words follow: "Somwhat more was by him written, which

being, as I thought, (fit to be private,) I would not adventure to make it publicke."

What was thus omitted from the letter in its publication has never been known. Until the letter has been reproduced as Smith wrote it, however, it is simply absurd to attempt to build an argument against Smith's veracity upon its alleged omissions. This answer to the main ground of attack would seem to be complete, and yet more may be added. We are not left entirely in the dark as to what was omitted by the publisher. He continues his preface as follows: "What may be expected concerning the scituation of the country, the nature of the clime, number of our people there resident, the manner of their government and living, the commodities to be produced, and the end and effect it may come too, I can say nothing more then is here written. Only what I have learned and gathered from generall consent of all (that I have conversed with all) as well marriners as others which have had employment that way, is that the country is excellent and pleasant, the clime temperate and healthfull, the ground fertill and good, the commodities to be expected (if well followed) many, for our people, the worst being already past, these former having indured the heate of the day, whereby those that shall succeede may at ease labour for their profit in the most sweete, cool, and temperate shade."

Two things are evident from these sentences, one, that what was omitted could only relate to the narrative of what had happened to the colonists, all else had been given fully to the public; another, that the desire of the publisher was to encourage further emigration to Virginia, and therefore what he left out of the narrative was in all probability matters which might tend to discourage emigrants.

This concealment of all matters tending to discourage emigration was enjoined on the colonists by the London Company, in the instructions given them when they sailed. A copy of these instructions is in the Library of Congress in manuscript. It has been printed by Mr. Neill, in his "History of the Virginia Company of London," pp. 8 to 14 inclusive.

In it we find the following words, "You shall do well to send a perfect relation by Captain Newport of all that is done, what height you are seated, how far into the land, what commodities

you find, what soil, woods and their several kinds, and so of all other things else to advertise particularly; and to suffer no man to return but by passport from the President and Counsel, nor to write any letters of anything that may discourage others." * * "Lastly and chiefly the way to prosper and achieve good success, is to make yourselves all of one mind, for the good of your country and your own, and to serve and fear God, the Giver of all Goodness, for every plantation which our Heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted out."

It is very probable from his preface that the publisher of the "True Relation" was a member of the London Company. He says, "happening upon this relation by chance, (as I take it at second or third hand) induced thereunto by divers well wishers of the action, and none wishing better towards it than myself, so faire footh as my poore abilitie can or may stretch too, I thought good to publish it."

He doubtless knew of the instructions of the Company to the colonists, and whatever he found in the letter of Smith which, in his judgment, was contrary to those instructions, and should not have been made public, he suppressed. Certain it is we find either as the work of Smith, or of the publisher, that several matters well attested by writers who published later, were omitted from this letter as published.

The following may be noted in this connection. During the voyage out, Smith was arrested on the charge of being implicated in an intended mutiny, and was thereby prevented from taking his seat in the Council for some time after the arrival at Jamestown. This is stated in the Oxford Tract, and the statement is corroborated by Wingfield in his "Discourse of Virginia," in his admission that he was fined £200 for slander in making the charge. No mention is made, however, of the charge, of the arrest, nor of the detention from his seat, in the "True Relation." The Oxford Tract informs us of three several efforts to abandon the colony, which were prevented by Smith at considerable personal hazard, and Wingfield admits that he offered £100 towards "fetching home the collonye, if the action was given over." No mention is made of these efforts to abandon the colony in Smith's letter, as published. The only passages which seem to make any allusion to the matter are found on pages 17 and 21. The first is in the following words: "Time

thus passing away, and having not above 14 daies vituals left, some motions were made about our presidents and Capt. Archer going to England to procure a supply." The other is as follows: "Our store being now indifferently well provided with corne, there was much adoe for to have the pinnace goe to England, against which Capt. Martin and myselfe standing chiefly against it, and in fine after much debatings pro and con, it was resolved to stay a furtner resolution." These passages indicate no effort to abandon the colony, but seem to have been worded so as to avoid that construction.

We have seen that on Smith's return from captivity, Archer had him tried and condemned, as accessory to the murder of his men who were slain by the Indians. Wingfield mentions this, and that he was saved from death by the timely arrival of Captain Newport. The "General History" also confirms Wingfield's account, but the published letter of Smith makes no mention of the matter.

The same reasons which determined Smith, or his publisher, to omit these well-attested incidents, doubtless induced the omission of the circumstances of Smith's rescue by Pocahontas, and of his deliverance by the Indian chief, Opechankanough, soon after his capture, when he was tied to a tree and his captors, who had promised him safety, were preparing to shoot him.

As the unjust treatment of Smith, indicating serious contentions amongst themselves, and the efforts to abandon the settlement, would have a tendency to "discourage others," and check emigration; so it might have been believed, and doubtless was, that a publication of the treacherous disposition of the Indians, which led them to break faith with their prisoners, and to put them to death contrary to their stipulations of surrender, and after their King had professed friendship, as we shall see he did, would have the same tendency; and we have seen that the colonists were forbidden to write anything home which might have that effect.

Another reason may be assigned also for Smith's not mentioning his rescue by Pocahontas in this letter. We are told in the Oxford Tract, that when Smith was arrested on the voyage to Virginia, the charge against him was that, "he intended to usurpe the government, murder the councell, and make himself king"; and when he was about to return to England in 1609, to be

treated for his wound, his enemies trumped up several frivolous charges against him, and one was, that "he would have made himself a king by marrying Pocahontas, Powhatan's daughter." (See Purchas' Pilgrims, vol. iv, p. 1731, where Richard Pots is given as authority for the statement which is taken from the Oxford Tract.) There can be no doubt of the fact that Pocahontas was greatly attached to Smith. The writer just quoted, in defending Smith from the charge, says, "Very oft she came to our fort with what she could get for Captain Smith, that ever loved and used all the country well, but her especially he much respected, and she so well requited it that when her father intended to have surprised him, she by stealth in the dark night came through the wild woods and told him of it. If he would, he might have married her." The "General History" states also (p. 112) that "though she had beene many times a preserver of him (Smith) and the whole colony, yet till this accident (her capture in 1613) she was never seene in Jamestown since his departure." With such charges brought against him on the voyage, and the disposition of his enemies to renew them, Smith might very well think it most prudent to say nothing in his letter of the affectionate conduct of the Indian Emperor's daughter towards him.

But whatever may have been the reason that this letter, as published, did not mention Smith's rescue by Pocahontas, enough has been said to show that its omission affords no ground for charging that the detailed account subsequently given, when the reasons for silence had ceased to exist, was false.

The silence of Wingfield as to this incident was to be expected. He and Smith were bitter enemies. Smith had recovered against him in a suit for slander, and had been active in having him deposed from the presidency, and keeping him a prisoner. Wingfield's object in writing was to defend himself, and to throw all the blame he could upon his enemies. Although his "Discourse of Virginia" purports to give what happened from day to day, yet it was evidently written in England after his return. He tells us (p. 91) that "somewhat before this tyme, (the execution of Kendall) the President and Councill had sent for the Keyes of my Coffers, supposing that I had some wrightings concerning the Collony. * * * Under cullor heereof they took my books of accompt, and all my noates that concerned the ex-

penses of the Collony, and instructions under the Cape-marchant's hande of the Stoare of provisions, and divers other bookes and trifles of my own proper goods, which I could never recover." In the preface, addressed apparently to the council in England for Virginia, he says, "My due respect to yourselves, my allegiance (if I may so term it) to the Virginean action, my good heed to my poore reputation, thrust a penne into my handes, so jealous am I to bee missing to any of them." We may safely conclude, therefore, that if he made any notes in Virginia they were taken away from him, and that he only commenced his manuscript, setting forth the defence of his administration, after he was freed from the imprisonment imposed upon him in the colony.

It would have been very remarkable if a writer so situated, and having such an object in view, had recorded in his book the passionate attachment of Pocahontas for Smith. He, indeed, makes no allusion to Pocahontas at all, although it is very certain she was frequently in Jamestown before he left on the 16th April, 1608, some three months after Smith's return from captivity. His account of Smith's captivity is very brief, and it would probably have been altogether omitted did it not enable him to strike at Archer, his bitterest enemy, who was, as he relates, improperly sworn as one of the Council during Smith's absence, and who attempted to put Smith to death on his return. He relates Smith's voyage up the Chickahominy until he could go no further in his canoe. He then adds the following: "Then hee went on shoare with his guide, and left Robinson and Emmery, twoe of our men, in the cannow; which were presently slayne by the Indians, Pamaonke's men, and hee himself taken prysoner, and by the means of his guide his lief was saved; and Pamaonke, having him prisoner, carryed him to his neybors, Wyroances [chiefs], to see if any of them knew him for one of those which had bene, some twoe or three yeeres before us, in a river amongst them northward, and taken awaie some Indians from them by force. At last he brought him to the great Powaton (of whome before wee had no knowledge), who sent him to our towne the viij of January."

This short passage is all that Wingfield devotes to the incidents of a captivity extending through at least a month, and which cover in narration a dozen pages of Smith's printed letter.

The disposition to say nothing to Smith's advantage is apparent. It is undoubtedly true that Smith so impressed himself upon the Indians while their captive, that he was sent back to Jamestown unhurt, and with an escort of honor. This we learn from "Purchas' Pilgrims," at page 1709, of volume iv, upon the authority of Anas Todkill, one of the colonists. Wingfield makes not the slightest allusion to this remarkable fact, but credits the saving of his life to his guide, whom Smith had tied to him when attacked by the Indians, and used as a protection from their arrows, as we learn from the "True Relation." Wingfield alludes to the incident in so loose a manner as to leave the impression that the Indian guide saved Smith after his capture instead of before.

That Wingfield was very careless in his statements is abundantly shown in his book. We need cite but one instance more of his want of accuracy. We have seen that he states that they had no knowledge of the Emperor Powhatan, before he sent Smith back to Jamestown on the 8th of January, 1608, but at pages 77 and 78 of his narrative he had previously stated that on the 25th of June, 1607, this same emperor had sent a messenger to Jamestown and sought their friendship.

We need not be suprised therefore that this careless writer, whose sole purpose was to defend himself from the charge of misbehavior in office, should omit all allusion to Smith's rescue.

William Strachey came to Virginia with Sir Thomas Gates, who arrived on the 23d May, 1610.

Upon his return to England in 1612, he published at Oxford a book he styled "Laws for Virginia." Prefixed to this book is an "Address to His Majesties Councell for the Colonie of Virginia Britannia," in which he says: "When I went forth upon this voyage (right worthy gentlemen), true it is, I held it a service of dutie (during the time of my unprofitable service, and purpose to stay in the colonie, for which way else might I adde unto the least hight of so heroicke and pious a building), to propose unto myself to be (though an unable) remembrancer of all accidents, occurrences, and undertakings thereunto adventitiall; in most of which, since the time our right famous sole governor then, now Lieutenant General Sir Thomas Gates, Knight, after the unsealing of his commission, hasted to our fleete in the West, there staying for him, I have, both in the Bermudas, and since in Virginia, beene a sufferer and an eie-witnesse, and the full storie

of both in due time shall consecrate unto your viewes, as unto whome by right it appertaineth. * * * * Howbeit, since many impediments as yet must detaine such my observations in the shadow of darknesses, untill I shall be able to deliver them perfect unto your judgments, I do, in the meantime, present a transcript of the *Toparchia*, or state of those duties by which their Colonie stands regulated and commaunded," &c., &c.

His determination thus expressed seems never to have been carried out. The only subsequent writing of the author on Virginia matters, of which the world has any knowledge, is a volume published in 1849 by the Hakluyt Society, entitled "The Historie of Travaille into Virginia," from a manuscript of the Sloane Collection in the British Museum, edited by R. H. Major, Esq. This volume contains two books, each having ten chapters. The first, as we are informed by the editor, the author designated, "The First Book of the First Decade," and the second, "The Second Book of the First Decade." It appears by this that the author intended to continue the work, dividing it into sections of ten books, or decades.

The first of the published books treats of Virginia, the second of New England, but neither enters into the history of the colonies. The title pages show that such was not the object of the writer. The book treating of Virginia has the following, "The first book of the history of travaille into Virginia Britannia, expressing the cosmographie and commodities of the country, together with the manners and customes of the people, gathered and observed as well by those who went first thither, as collected by William Strachey, Gent., three years thither employed secretarie of State, and of counsaile, with the right Honorable, the Lord La-warre, His Majestis Lord Governor and Captain General of the Colony."

This book mentions Pocahontas in giving the names of her father's children, and gives the several names by which she was called. It also illustrates the manners and customs of the Indian girls by describing her playing with the boys at Jamestown when under thirteen years of age. Nothing is said, however, about her services to Smith or to the colony, they being reserved, doubtless, for the proposed history. Much of the book is taken from Smith's description of the country and its inhabitants, annexed to his map of Virginia. The author evidently had the greatest

confidence in Smith, as is shown by his reference to him on page 41, in speaking of some of the Indian tribes. He says: "Their severall habitations are more plainly described by the annexed mappe set forth by Capt. Smith, of whose paines taken herein I leave to the censure of the reader to judge. Sure I am there will not returne from thence, in hast, any one who hast bene more industrious, or who hath had (Capt. Geo. Percie excepted) greater experience amongst them, however misconstruction maye traduce here at home, where is not easily seene the mixed sufferances, both of body and mynd, which is there daylie, and with no few hazards and hearty griefes undergon." On the margin of this passage the author has these words, "A dew remembrance of Capt. Smyth, vide lib. iii, cap." This third book, never written, so far as we know, was designed doubtless to give the "accidents, occurrences and undertakings" in the Colony during the time of Captain Smith, which embraced the first three years of its existence. Had the author written this third book and left out the rescue of Captain Smith by Pocahontas, it would have been an omission of importance in this discussion, but that he left the rescue out of a book only relating to the "cosmographie and and commodities of the country, together with the manners and customes of the people," is not at all remarkable and of no importance whatever.

The next work relied on to impeach Smith's veracity is the historical, or second, part of the publication known as the "Oxford Tract." It has the following as a title page:

"The Proceedings of the English Colonie in Virginia since their first beginning from England, in the Yeare of our Lord, 1606, till this present, 1612, with all their accidents that befell them in their Journies and Discoveries. Also the Salvages discourses, orations and relations of the Bordering nighbours, and how they became subject to the English. Unfolding even the fundamental causes from whence have sprang so many miseries to the undertakers and scandals to the businesse. Taken faithfully as they were written out of the writings of Thomas Studley, the first provant maister, Anas Todkill, Walter Russell, Doctor of Phisicke, Nathaniel Powell, William Phettyplace, Richard Wyffin, Thomas Abbay, Tho. Hope, Rich. Potts, and the labours of divers other diligent observers, that were residents in Virginia. And perused and confirmed by diverse now resident in England that

were actors in this busines. By W. S. At Oxford. Printed by Joseph Barnes, 1612."

It appears by an address to the reader, signed by T. Abbay, and a note addressed to Captain Smith by Dr. Symonds, and printed on the last page of the volume, that it was compiled by Richard Pots out of the writings of a number of Smith's companions in Virginia, "whose discourses are signed by their names," William Simons (or Symonds), Doctor of Divinity, then gave it an editorial supervision, and passing through the hands of many to peruse, it chanced in the hands of Thomas Abbay, who knowing, as he says, the writers to be honest men, and being a witness to a part of the transactions, published it. The first part of the Oxford Tract consists of a map of Virginia, with a description of the country, its climate, soil and productions, and an account of the natives. This was the work of Smith, as we learn in his "General History," where it is reproduced. The second or historical part, contains none of Smith's writings. Dr. Symonds, in his note to Smith, states that it was compiled from the discourses and relations "of such which have walked and observed the land of Virginia with you." It is a thin volume, and only purports to be a condensation of the writings of the colonists. The incidents of Smith's captivity are related in these words: "A month those Barbarians kept him prisoner, many strange triumphes and conjurations they made of him, yet he so demeaned himselfe amongst them, as he not only diverted them from surprising the Fort, but procured his owne libertie, and got himselfe and his company such estimation amongst them, that these Salvages admired him as a demi God. So returning to the Fort, &c."

The writings from which this tract was compiled have not been preserved, and we know not what they contained other than what is contained in the compilation. When they were penned, the instruction not to write home "anything that may discourage others," was still in force, and doubtless caused the omission of many incidents of personal hazard. Whether these original manuscripts contained any allusion to Smith's rescue, we can never know with certainty, but the fact of its omission from a condensed compilation of them, can have no weight against Smith's reiterated statements concerning it.

The Rev. Samuel Purchas, in his work, called "Purchas, his Pilgrimage," first published in 1613, used the Oxford tract in

writing of Virginia, but condensed it further. He does not enter into the particulars of Smith's captivity; all that he devotes to it is in these words: "but after a month he procured himselfe not only libertie, but great admiration amongst them, and returning, &c." Nothing, therefore, can be concluded against Smith's account of his captivity by reason of this book, more than is proved by the omissions from the Oxford Tract. As this writer afterwards bore testimony to the truth of Smith's "General History" in more ways than one, it can hardly be seriously contended that the omission from the several editions of his Pilgrimage of all allusion to Smith's rescue, can be relied on to prove Smith's account of it false, even though one edition was issued after Pocahontas visited England.

The next writer, relied on by the assailants of Smith, is Ralph Hamor. His book was printed in 1615, and bears the title, "A true discourse of the present estate of Virginia, and the successe of the affaires there till the 18 of June, 1614, together with a relation of the severall English townes and fortes, the assured hopes of that countrie and the peace concluded with the Indians. The christening of Powhatan's daughter and her marriage with an Englishman. Written by Raphe Hamor the yonger, late Secretarie in that Colonie."

This writer does not enter into the history of the Colony during Smith's stay with it. He came with Sir Thomas Gates, along with William Strachey, in 1610, and his earliest historical allusions are of that date. He tells of the capture of Pocahontas, and of her marriage to Rolfe, but he makes no allusion to her previous history. Had he undertaken to recount her services and left out her rescue of Smith, it would have been evidence against the truthfulness of Smith's account, but it cannot be thought strange that he did not mention this one incident of her previous life, when he mentioned no other. This writer also declared his intention to write a history of the Colony from its beginning, which he never carried out, so far as is now known.

The assailants of Smith admit that his statements in the "True Relation" are true. Indeed, they base their arguments upon that assumption. If, however, the silence of Wingfield, of Strachey, of the Oxford Tract, of "Purchas' Pilgrimage," and of Hamor, is to be taken as evidence of the falsity of Smith's statement con-

cerning his rescue, it will equally disprove the many incidents of his captivity given in the "True Relation" and not mentioned in these works.

Let us now examine the second ground of attack, namely, the alleged inconsistencies between the "True Relation" and the subsequent publications of Smith.

At page 16 of the "True Relation" an account is given of an expedition by Smith to Kegquouhtan, or Kecoughtan (now Hampton) to procure corn by trade with the Indians. No mention is made of an attack on the natives. In the "General History," in an account of the same expedition, at page 45, it is stated that he fired on the Indians, and captured their idol, called "Okee." In both accounts, it is stated, that at first the Indians treated Smith and his companions scornfully, thinking they were famishing men, but afterwards brought them such provisions as they needed. The reason why the attack was left out of the letter sent to England by Smith in 1608 is evident from the narrative in the General History itself. After stating the scornful reception given Smith by the Indians, it continues, "But, seeing by trade and courtesie there was nothing to be had, he made bold to try such conclusions as necessitie inforced, though contrary to his commission, let fly his muskets, ran his boat on shore, whereat they all fled into the woods," &c., &c. We find in the instructions, sent with the Colony by the London Company, this direction, "In all your passages you must have great care not to offend the naturals, if you can eschew it." (See Neill's "Virginia Company of London," p. 11.)

This was Smith's first trading expedition, and in order to supply his wants, he found it necessary to disobey instructions. We can well understand why he might not choose to relate his disobedience to orders in his letter to England, and his not doing so should not throw even a suspicion on his statement subsequently given in the History. There is an expression in the account of this expedition found in the Oxford Tract, however, which is corroborative of the statement of the attack found in the "General History." The Oxford Tract has the following account: "Being but 6 or 7 in company, he went down the river to Kecoughton, where, at first, they scorned him as a starved man. Yet he so dealt with them, that the next day they loaded his

boat with corne." How he dealt with them is explained in the account found in the "General History." It is apparent that there is no contradiction between Smith's several accounts but a mere omission of the attack in one of them, for which the publisher may have been responsible.

In the "True Relation" Smith gives an account of his capture, in which he states, that having carried his barge up the Chickahominy river as far as he could, he determined to hire a canoe with which to continue his explorations. He thereupon carried the barge back to the Indian town, Apocant, and left it there with seven men, expressly charging them not to go ashore until his return. He then took two of his own men and two Indians as guides, and went forward with the canoe some twelve miles higher than he had been able to go in the barge, and then going ashore with one of the Indians, he left the other and his two men, Robinson and Emry, with the canoe. He had not gone far before he was attacked by the Indian chief, Opechankanough, with 200 men, by whom he was captured, and who informed him that the men at the canoe were slain. In the "New England Trials," published in 1622, in referring to his capture, Smith says, "It is true, in our greatest extremitie, they shot me, slew three of my men, and by the folly of them that fled, took me prisoner." Both, Mr. Deane and Mr. Adams, are severe in their criticisms upon this last statement of Smith, treating it as a slander upon the men he lost. They claim that it is inconsistent with the first account, and Mr. Adams pronounces it mendacious, and "creditable neither to Smith's veracity nor to his sense of honor." It would have been more creditable to these critics had they read carefully the several accounts given by Smith of this matter before they criticised any one of them. The "True Relation" does not say what became of the men left with the barge at Apocant, but the "General History," at p. 46, says of them, "but he was not long absent, but his men went ashore, whose want of government gave both occasion and opportunity to the salvages to surprise one George Cassen, whom they slew, and much failed not to have cut off the boat and all the rest. * * * The salvages having drawne from George Cassen, whether Captain Smith was gone, prosecuting that opportunity, they followed him with 300 bowmen, conducted by the King of Pamaunkee, who, in divisions,

searching the turnings of the river, found Robinson and Emry by the fire-side, those they shot full of arrowes and slew. Then finding the Captaine, as is said," &c. It is plain, from this narrative, that the "want of government" of the men left with the barge resulted in the capture of George Cassen, and the information obtained from him enabled the Indians to capture Smith. All seven of the men left with the barge went ashore, and as they were armed, it was reasonable for Smith to have believed that had they stood by each other and not fled, Cassen would not have been captured, and if Cassen had not been captured, he himself would not have been; when he says, therefore, "by the folly of them that fled," in the passage in the "New England Trials," he means what he described in the "General History" by the words "want of government," and this he ascribes to the men left at the barge and not to the men left at the canoe. So far from charging the men at the canoe with having fled, he tells us in the "General History" that he supposes that they were asleep when they were killed.

Strachey, at page 52 of his book, gives a corroboration of Smith's statement, that Cassen was slain because of disobedience to the order not to go ashore till Smith's return. In relating the manner in which the Indians put to death their enemies, Strachey says: "Thus themselves reported that they executed an Englishman, one George Cawson, whom the women enticed up from the barge unto their houses, at a place called Apocant."

The several accounts given by Smith, of his treatment while a captive, have been claimed to be inconsistent, and so determined has been the effort to show inconsistencies, that some of the passages compared have been made to suffer torture. The first passages so compared are the statements of what occurred immediately on the capture. In the "True Relation" Smith says: "I perceived by the aboundance of fires all over the woods at each place I expected when they would execute me, yet they used me with what kindness they could."

In the "General History," after describing his gift to their King of his "round ivory double compass Dyall" soon after his capture, and their admiration of it, he continues as follows: "Notwithstanding, within an houre after they tyed him to a tree, and as many as could stand about him prepared to shoot him, but

the King holding up the compass in his hand, they all laid downe their Bowes and Arrowes, and in a triumphant manner led him to Orapaks, where he was after their manner kindly feasted and well used." The real difference in these accounts consists in the latter giving the preparation to kill him, and his preservation by Opechankanough's holding up to view the wonderful compass. The kindness of their treatment otherwise is stated in both narratives. When we remember that the "True Relation," which omits this incident, has never been published as Smith wrote it, we cannot conclude that Smith in that letter made no allusion to it. It may be that he gave it, and his editor included it in the omitted items.

The printed text of the "True Relation" indicates, in fact, that something was omitted from the manuscript just where this incident should have come in. The reader will have noticed doubtless that the sentence quoted from the "True Relation" is ungrammatical and incoherent as it stands. If, however, something was omitted from the manuscript between the words "woods" and "at," we can understand how the want of connection in the sentence was produced.

It is claimed that the accounts of the provisions given Smith, and the guard put over him the first night after his capture, are conflicting, as they appear in the "True Relation," and the "General History." Let us compare them. The accounts of his first night's treatment are as follows:

In the *True Relation*, "The Captain conducting me to his lodging, a quarter of Venison and some ten pound of bread I had for supper, what I left was reserved for me, and sent with me to my lodging."	In the *General History*, "Smith they conducted to a long house, where thirtie or fortie tall fellowes did guard him, and ere long more bread and Venison was brought him then would have served twentie men."

There is not the slightest inconsistency in the accounts. A quarter of venison and ten pounds of bread were more than enough to serve twenty men. The careless critics, however, have confounded his subsequent treatment as detailed in the "True Relation," with what happened on the first night, and thus have created the apparent inconsistency they claim to have discovered. After the passage just given the narrative in the "True Relation"

continues: "each morning 3 women presented me three great platters of fine bread, more venison then ten men could devour I had, my goune, points and garters, my compass and a tablet they gave me again, though 8 ordinarily guarded me, I wanted not what they could devise to content me; and still our longer acquaintance increased our better affection." It is apparent from this that as they became better acquainted the guard was reduced from the thirty or forty of the first night to eight ordinarily. There seems to have been but little reduction in his provisions. Three great platters of bread and more venison than ten men could devour might still be more bread and venison than would have served twenty men, and thus, as to the provisions, there would have been no real inconsistency had this referred to the first night.

After his capture, Smith was carried to several places by Opechankanough, and at each found a house of the great Emperor, Powhatan. In the "True Relation" (p. 30) he says, speaking of this Emperor to Opechankanough, "to him I tolde him I must goe, and so return to Paspehigh," (the Indian name for Jamestown.) This statement has been criticised by Mr. Adams. He says: "Only a few days after he (Smith) was taken prisoner, he represents himself as giving orders to Opechankanough to take him to Powhatan, and even at this time he knew he was to be allowed to return to Jamestown." This, Mr. Adams thinks, is inconsistent with Smith's statement in the "General History," that he expected all the time of his imprisonment to be put to one death or another.

Wingfield, in his Discourse, (pp. 77–8,) states that on the 25th of June preceding Smith's capture, the Emperor Powhatan sent a messenger to Jamestown, offering peace and friendship. It was natural for Smith, when the captive of a king who was in subjection to the Emperor, to ask to be carried to Powhatan, with whom the Colony had already entered into articles of friendship, and had he demanded to be carried to him, he would have but claimed a right, which, by boldness, he was endeavoring to make his captor respect. The language of Smith, however, may as well be considered a request as a command.

The treatment which he received when he was carried before Powhatan is differently related in the "True Relation" and the

"General History," and this difference has doubtless given rise to the attacks upon Smith's veracity. Let us compare the two accounts:

From the *True Relation*, "Hee kindly welcomed me with good wordes, and great Platters of Sundrie Victuals, assuring me his friendship, and my libertie within four dayes, hee much delighted in Opechanconough's relation of what I had described to him and oft examined me upon the same."

From the *General History*, "Having feasted him after their best barbarous manner they could, a long consultation was held, but the conclusion was, two great stones were brought before Powhatan, then as many as could layd hands on him, dragged him to them, and thereon laid his head, and being ready with their clubs to beate out his brains, Pocahontas, the King's dearest daughter, when no entreaty could prevaile, got his head in her armes, and laid her owne upon his to save him from death, whereat the Emperor was contented he should live to make him hatchets, and her bells, beads and copper."

We have already seen that the omission of his rescue from the "True Relation" might well have been made by Smith, or by the publisher of that partially printed letter, under the instruction from the London Company, the treacherous conduct of Powhatan towards his prisoner and the colony being calculated to discourage others from coming to Virginia. An examination, however, of the text of the "True Relation" just cited, discloses the fact that the publisher must have left out a part of what Smith wrote in describing his first interview with Powhatan, at which interview his condemnation and rescue occurred. It is apparent that all that is printed up to and including the word "dayes," relates to what happened at the time Smith was brought before Powhatan, while the words which immediately follow, only separated by a comma, namely, "hee much delighted in Opechanconough's relation of what I had described to him, and *oft* examined me upon the same," relate to what happened in subsequent interviews, when some of the wonders of geometry and astronomy, explained to Opechankanough by Smith, were the topic of conversation.

The text, as it is, presents an abrupt transition from the inter-

view of the first day to the interviews of subsequent days, which can be satisfactorily explained only upon the theory of an omission by the publisher of part of the occurrences of the first day, and an effort to conceal the omission by the arrangement of the text presented.

The "True Relation," in describing Smith's return to Jamestown, says: "Hee sent me home with 4 men, one that usually carried my gowne and knapsack after me, two others loaded with bread and one to accompanie me." The "General History" says: "So to Jamestown with 12 guides, Powhatan sent him." These statements are claimed to be contradictory. It is evident, however, that in the first account Smith merely gave the number of men detailed to wait upon his person, while in the second he meant to enumerate the entire company sent as guides, probably a misprint for guards. That the men sent with him numbered more than four is shown by the parallel passage in Purchas' Pilgrims (vol. iv, p. 1709), which is given from the writings of Anas Todkill, and is also found in the "Oxford Tract." Says this writer: "Powhatan having sent with this Captaine divers of his men loaded with provisions, hee had conditioned, and so appointed his trustie messengers to bring but two or three of our great ordinances, but the messengers being satisfied with the sight of one of them discharged, ran away, amazed with fear." We are told in the "True Relation" that Smith had described to the Indians the ordnance, in order to prevent an attack on the fort. The messengers sent with his letter to the fort, while he was a prisoner, had also seen these large guns. It must have been, therefore, that the "divers men" sent to bring two or three of them to Powhatan were more than four.

It is asserted by Mr. Adams and others, that Smith contradicts himself by representing in the "True Relation" that the Indians treated him with continual kindness, while, in the "General History," he says he was all the time of his captivity in continual dread of being put to death. When we remember that he was the captive of a savage people, who had killed his companions, it does not seem strange that no amount of kindness could allay his fears. It does seem strange that his critics should think otherwise, and should read so carelessly the texts they criticise. The passage they refer to in the "General History" is a part

of the account of his return to Jamestown, and is in these words: "That night they quartered in the woods, he still expecting (as he had done all this long time of his imprisonment) every houre to be put to one death or other for all their feasting."

We have seen that in the "True Relation," soon after his capture, these words occur: "At each place I expected when they would execute me, yet they used me with what kindnesse they could." Afterwards it is related in this book that an Indian attempted to kill him while under guard, and that one of the places he was carried to was called Topahanocke, where it was sought to identify him as one of a party who, some years previously, had slain their King, and captured some of their people. Smith also tells us in this book that their excess of kindness aroused his suspicions. He says: "So fat they fed mee, that I much doubted they intended to have sacrificed mee to the Quiyoughquosicke, which is a superiour power they worship." Smith had, before his capture, formed a very correct estimate of the treacherous character of the Indians, and both accounts that he gave of his captivity show that his distrust of them kept him in continual fear of death at their hands. The expression in the "History," "for all their feasting," indicates the kindness shown him, which is detailed in the "True Relation." And if we have no details of cruel dispositions recorded in the "True Relation," such as are recorded in the "General History," we must remember that the "True Relation," as we have it, is a mutilated book, and that there was a reason for leaving out of it such incidents.

It has been claimed by both Mr. Adams and Mr. Neill that the accounts given by Smith, of what happened at Jamestown upon his return from captivity, are inconsistent. These accounts are as follows:

True Relation.

"Each man with truest signes of joy they could expresse welcomed me, except Mr. Archer, & some 2 or 3 of his, who was then in my absence, sworne counsellor, though not with the consent of Capt. Martin: great blame & imputation was laide upon mee by them for the losse of our two men which the Indians slew: insomuch that they purposed to depose me, but in the midst of my miseries, it pleased God to send Captaine Newport, who arriving there the same night, so tripled our joy, as for awhile these plots against me were deferred, though with much malice against me, which Captain Newport in short time did plainly see."

General History.

"Now, in Jamestowne they were all in combustion, the strongest preparing once more to run away with the Pinnace; which with the hazzard of his life, with sakre falcon & musket shot, Smith forced now the third time to stay or sinke. Some no better than they should be, had plotted with the President, the next day to have put him to death, by the Leviticall law, for the lives of Robinson & Emry, pretending the fault was his that had led them to their ends: but he quickly tooke such order with such Lawyers, that he layd them by the heeles till he sent some of them prisoners for England."

The statements, that upon his return Smith prevented the running off with the pinnace, and caused the persons who had plotted his death to be arrested, and some of them to be sent to England, are those found in the "General History," which are claimed to be inconsistent with the narrative in the "True Relation." It will be seen that while they are additional to the first narrative, they are in nowise contradictory of it. That they are true we have the testimony of Anas Todkill, then with the Colony, who is cited by Purchas in his "Pilgrims," as recording that Smith, on his return, "once more staied the Pinnace her flight for England," and that Wingfield and Archer were carried to England by Newport on his return. Wingfield states also that Archer would have been hung, had not Newport advised against it.

Some of our critics have fancied that they have fixed a falsehood on Smith in his account of his first landing on the island of Mevis, related in the continuation of his "General History," and found in the second part of the Richmond edition of 1819, chapter 26. Smith says: "In this little (ile) of Mevis, more than twenty years agoe, I have remained a good time together, to wod and water and refresh my men." This was published in 1629, and refers to the touching at that island of the colony under Captain Newport on its way to Virginia in 1607. Our critics construe Smith's language to mean that he, and not New-

port, was in command of the expedition when they touched at Mevis. An examination of the context demonstrates that Smith meant to convey no such idea.

In the beginning of this continuation, and afterwards in this very chapter, Smith refers the reader for particulars as to the planting of the colony at Jamestown to the "General History." This book states the fact that Newport commanded the expedition; and the further fact that when they touched at the island of Mevis, Smith was a prisoner under the charge of plotting a mutiny. This last is referred to by Smith in this chapter in these words: "Such factions here we had as commonly attend such voyages, that a paire of gallowes was made, but Capt. Smith, for whom they were intended, could not be perswaded to use them." Had Smith intended to deceive, he would not have referred the reader to another volume, of which he was then writing a continuation, in which he had made a different statement. But any one familiar with the history of the colonization of Virginia will readily understand the expression, "my men," as used by Smith. The orders for the expedition, as published by Neill, show that soldiers under officers were a part of the colony; and Percy, in his narrative printed by Purchas in volume iv. of his "Pilgrims," tells us that while on this island they "kept centinels and Courts de gard at every captaine's quarter," fearing an assault from the Indians. There can be no doubt that Smith was one of the captains, not only from his previous military training and rank, but from the fact that we find among the verses addressed to him on the publication of his "General History," some by soldiers, who state that he was their Captain in Virginia. It should be remembered also that Smith was active in getting up the colony in England, and, upon their landing in Virginia, was soon looked upon as their leader. The "Oxford Tract" tells us that he saved the colony from starvation by the provisions he got from the Indians, and from extermination by the control he acquired over the Indian princes, and that he explored the country, built Jamestown, and prevented the colony from abandoning it. In fact, that he was the real founder of Virginia.* It was not improper, therefore, that he should claim that

* It has been claimed that Lord Delaware was the real founder of Virginia, because he prevented its abandonment in 1610, and by his wise administration

honor, as he does in the conclusion of this chapter upon the isle of Mevis. He says: "Now to conclude the travels and adventures of Captaine Smith, how he planted Virginia, * * * you may read at large in his generall history of Virginia, the Summer Iles and New England."

But we need not pursue this charge of inconsistencies further, as time would fail us to notice every inconsistency charged by the numerous and often ill-informed assailants of Smith. Those not noticed are even more easily disposed of than those we have already exposed.

The bitterest of all of these assailants is the Rev. E. D. Neill, who has written a history of the London Company. When King James determined to take away the charter of the London Company, in 1624, an attempt was made by its enemies to obtain its records. Thereupon the minutes were copied for the Earl of Southampton, the President, and this copy was afterwards bought by Colonel William Byrd, of Virginia, and was used by the historian Stith. Subsequently it came into the possession of Thomas Jefferson, and was purchased with Mr. Jefferson's library by Congress. These minutes only commence on the 28th of April, 1619. In the Congressional Library there are in addition two manuscript volumes, one containing letters of the Company and the colony, with other papers, from 1621 to 1625, and the other containing some copies of early colonial papers. These valuable manuscripts were used by Mr. Neill in the preparation of his book. He says at page v. of his preface, "On the 15th of July (1624), the King ordered all their [the Company's] papers to be given to a commission, which afterwards met weekly at the house of Sir Thomas Smith [the former treasurer of the Company]. The entries in the minutes were damaging to Smith and others of the commission, and it is presumed that no great effort was made to preserve the originals. Re-

---

put the colony on a firm footing.

Lord Delaware should have all honor for what he did for the colony, but before his arrival Smith had three times prevented its abandonment, had preserved it from starvation and destruction for nearly three years, and had left it, on a change of administration, in a condition to take care of itself with proper management. When a man goes out with a colony and accomplishes this much, he may be well called its founder.

peated searches have been made for them in England, but they have not been discovered."

At page 211 of his book, in a note, he says: "Captain Smith's 'General History' was published after the *Quo Warranto* was issued against the Virginia Company, and it is evident that he wrote in the interest of their opponents. There is no evidence beyond his statement, that the letters which he publishes as written to the Company were ever received by them."

Smith's "General History" was published in 1624, the year the Company's charter was taken from it, and when most of the members of the Company from its foundation were alive; and yet Mr. Neill would create the impression that Smith forged the letters to the Company which he published, when there were hundreds alive who would have exposed the forgery. The first letter given in the "General History" is found at page 200 (Richmond edition), and was in reply to a letter sent to the president and Council by the London Company, upon the return of Captain Newport in the fall of 1608. Smith had been made president in September of that year. The "Oxford Tract" tells us, "by the election of the Councell & the request of the company, Captaine Smith received the Letters Patents, which till then by no meanes he would accept, though he was often importuned thereunto." It thus became his duty to answer the communication from the London Company.

The second letter is found at page 79 of the second part of the same edition. On the 22d March, 1622, there was a terrible massacre of the colonists by the Indians. Smith, who was then in London, relates that he "did intreat & move them to put in practice his old offer, seeing now it was time to use both it & him;" and then follows the letter. The offer, which was to return to Virginia, was probably made before 1614, when he commenced exploring New England. Now, until we know that there is a complete collection of the company's letters preserved, nothing can be concluded against Smith, because his letters are not found among the records. Of course no letters before 1621 could be found, as the collection commences during that year; and as we learn from Mr. Neill's book that many of the papers were destroyed, and especially those which might be damaging to Sir Thomas Smith and others having possession of them under the King's commission, and as we find Captain Smith's

letters reflect upon the government of the colony under Sir Thomas Smith and his successor, we need not be surprised that Mr. Neill has not found them in the collection now extant.

Mr. Neill attempts to produce the impression that Smith, if wounded at all in 1609, did not leave the colony upon that account, and because there was no surgeon there to treat him, as he states in the "History," but that he left because he was arrested upon charges and sent to England. It so happens that the fact of his being severely wounded by an accidental explosion of gunpowder, and the further fact that the lack of a surgeon determined him to sail for England in a ship preparing to leave Jamestown, are both related in the "Oxford Tract," and that Smith copies the passages into his "General History." The "Oxford Tract" relates also how charges against him, of the most frivolous nature, were gotten up by his enemies after he had determined to return.

It appears by the published list of original subscribers to the London Company that Captain Smith only subscribed nine pounds, and as in asking remuneration afterwards of the Company, he claimed to have spent upon Virginia "a verie great matter," Mr. Neill concludes that in this he was false. In his haste to condemn Smith he has not taken time to read him. At page 102, of the second part of the "General History" (Richmond edition), Smith states that he spent "more than five hundred pounds in procuring the Letters Patents and setting forward." His claim for special remuneration was not because of his subscription to the capital stock of the Company, as every member would have had the same ground of claim, but because of what he had expended and accomplished in addition, as his petition for reward, found in Mr. Neill's book, at page 214, plainly shows. That the committee to which his petition was referred allowed it, may be fairly inferred from a speech of Smith before the Company, reported by Mr. Neill at page 386.*

*On the 4th of February, 1623, Captain Smith, in a discussion concerning the salaries of officers, is reported to have said: "That havinge spent upon Virginia a verie great matter, he did, by God's blessinge, hope to receave this yeare a good quantity of Tobacco, which he would not willingly have come under the hands of them that would performe the buissiness for love, and not upon a good and competent salary." The same author shows that the Company owned much of the tobacco shipt from the colony, and Smith's expec-

Another intimation made by this writer is, that as the records do not show that Smith's offer to the company to write a history of Virginia was accepted, his statement in the book that he wrote it at the instance of the Company, is false. Mr. Neill has given us at page 210 the offer made April 12, 1621, which shows on its face that it was made upon the request of some of the members. What was the action of the committee to whom it was referred, we know not, so far as Mr. Neill's extracts from the records go, but as only a few of the papers of the Company have been preserved, nothing can be concluded from the absence of the committee's report, and it would seem unreasonable to discredit Smith's published statement in regard to the matter, made when so many witnesses were alive.

Without pursuing further the details of Mr. Neill's attack upon Smith, it will be sufficient to expose the character of his book for us to notice the authority he has followed in its preparation, and the manner in which he has followed it. At page 16, in a note, he says: "For the facts relative to the early days of the Colony, I am indebted to Wingfield's 'Discourse of Virginia,' edited by Deane, and Capt. Newport's 'Relation,' first printed from manuscripts in vol. iv, Am. Ant. Soc. Coll." The "Relation" of Captain Newport's discoveries in Virginia ended with his return to England, June 22, 1607 and Wingfield's "Discourse" takes up the narrative on that day. There is nothing derogatory to Smith in the first. On the contrary, it shows that Newport selected him as one of the persons to accompany him in exploring the James river, and on his return had him sworn one of the Council. In following the narrative of Wingfield, however, Mr. Neill has shown himself unworthy of confidence as a historian. The "Oxford Tract" is entitled to the highest credit as a record of the early history of the Colony. The Rev. Wm. Symonds, a minister of high character and considerable learning, compared it with the writings from which it was compiled. He then sent it to Captain Smith with a note, printed at the end of the volume, in these words:

---

tation could only have been founded on the allowance of his claim by the committee. The Company, however, was in difficulties, and its charter was taken from it during the next year, and before Smith received any reward for his expenditures and sacrifices.

"Captaine Smith, I returne you the fruit of my labours, as Mr. Crashaw requested me, which I bestowed in reading the discourses & hearing the relations of such which have walked and observed the land of Virginia with you. The paines I tooke was great: yet did the nature of the argument, and hopes I conceaved of the expedition, give me exceeding content. I cannot finde there is anything but what they all affirme, or cannot contradict: the land is good; as there is no cities, so no sonnes of Anak: al is open for labor of a good and wise inhabitant: and my prayer shall ever be, that so faire a land may be inhabited by those that professe and love the Gospell."

In this book we have the following account of Wingfield's administration, commencing with the departure of Newport:

"Being thus left to our fortunes, it fortuned that within tenne daies scarse ten amongst us coulde either goe, or well stand, such weaknes and sicknes oppressed us. * * * * Had we beene as free from all sinnes as gluttony and drunkennes, we might have bin canonized for saints; But our President would never have ben admitted, for ingrossing to his private (use) otemeale, sacke, oile, acquavite, beefe, egs, or what not, but the kettel; that indeede he allowed equally to be distributed, and that was halfe a pinte of wheat and as much barly boyled with water for a man a day, and this having fryed some 26 weeks in the Ship's hold, contained as many worms as graines; so that we might truly call it rather so much bran than corne: our drinke was water, our lodgings castles in the aire. With this lodging and diet, our extreame toile in bearing and planting pallisadoes, so strained and bruised us, and our continuall labour in the extremitie of the heate had so weakened us, as were cause sufficient to have made us miserable in our native country, or any other place in the world. From May to September, those that escaped lived upon sturgeon and sea-crabs, 50 in this time we buried. The rest seeing the President's proiects to escape these miseries in our Pinnace by flight (who all this time had neither felt want nor sickness) so moved our dead spirits, as we deposed him; and established Ratcliffe in his place."

George Percy, in the fragment of his narrative preserved by Purchas, relates that, "there was certaine Articles laid against Master Wingfield, which was then President, thereupon he was

not only displaced out of his Presidentship, but also from being of the Councell."

Wingfield, in his defence of himself, does not deny the charge of attempting to make his escape in the pinnace while he was president, although he denies the charge of feasting while the others were starving, and attempts to justify his administration at the expense of the rest of the colony. Purchas had before him, and cited the "Oxford Tract" and Wingfield's "Discourse" in preparing his books, and he knew personally no doubt the writers of both works, as he took part in the affairs of the London Company. With this great advantage he follows the "Oxford Tract," and condemns Wingfield's administration. Mr. Neill, however, with nothing like the advantages of Purchas, follows Wingfield, and discredits the other colonists. This might be attributed to want of sound judgment alone had he faithfully followed him; but what condemnation is too severe for one who omits from his citations of the author he professes to follow, facts tending to justify a good opinion of the persons that author was attacking, This is what Mr. Neill has done. At page 15 he says: "Dissensions arose during the voyage, and on the 12th of February John Smith was suspected of mutiny." On page 21, quoting from Wingfield the grounds of hostility towards him, he says: "Mr. Smyth's quarrel, because his name was mentioned in the intended and confessed mutiny by Galthropp." Mr. Neill makes no other allusion to this charge against Smith, but leaves his readers under the impression that it was true, or at least was never disproved. Now Wingfield, in the very book relied on by Mr. Neill, states enough to show that Smith was innocent of the charge. He says: "The 17th daie of September I was sent for to the court to answer a complaint exhibited against me by Jehu Robinson; for that, when I was president, I did saie, hee, with others, had consented to run awaye with the Shallop to Newfoundland. At another tyme I must answere Mr. Smyth, for that I had said hee did conceal an intended mutany. I tould Mr. Recorder those words would beare no actions; that one of the causes was done without the lymits mentioned in the Patent graunted to us. * * * The jury gave one of them 100, & the other two hundred pound damages for slaunder." This passage shows that the charge against Smith was made by Wingfield during the voyage, and was investigated in an action for slander, to which action

Wingfield's plea was that the slanderous words were spoken outside of the jurisdiction conferred by their patent, and that the jury convicted him of the slander, and fined him two hundred pounds.

Mr. Neill has not been content, however, to omit statements of fact as to Smith alone. He has treated all of Wingfield's opponents in the same way. On page 19 he thus relates the deposing of Wingfield: "At length a plot was formed by Ratcliffe, Smith, and Martin, to depose Wingfield and form a triumvirate. On the eleventh of September they brought him before them, Ratcliffe acting as president, and preferred the following frivolous charges: Ratcliffe charged that he had refused him a penny whitle, a chicken, a spoonful of beer, & given him bad corn; Smith alleged that he had told him he lied: Martin complained that he had been called indolent. After this he was placed on board of the pinnace in the river, and kept as a prisoner." The charges here given by Mr. Neill, and he gives no others, seem to have been verbal complaints against Wingfield, but not the charges upon which he was deposed. After mentioning these complaints, Wingfield says, "I asked Mr. President if I should answere theis compl'ts, and whether he had ought els to charge me with all, with that he pulled out a paper booke loaded full with artycles against me, and give them Mr. Archer to reade." None of these written charges are given by Wingfield, but he relates how he cut short their reading by appealing to the King. He adds: "Then Mr. Archer pulled out of his bosome another paper book full of artycles against me, desiring that he might reade them in the name of the Collony." He fails also to give these articles, but says of them, "I have forgotten the most of the artycles, they were so slight." Wingfield, while not giving the charges in detail, however, is evidently endeavoring to defend himself from them in his book, and we gather from the defence that they were, as stated in the "Oxford Tract," and not as given by Mr. Neill.

In order to strengthen his attack upon Smith, Mr. Neill brings to his aid the Rev. Thomas Fuller, who, in his "Worthies of England," gave a short sketch of Smith, in which this sentence is found: "From the Turks in Europe he passed to the pagans in America, where such his perils, preservations, dangers, deliverances, they seem to most men above belief, to some beyond

truth. Yet we have two witnesses to attest them—the prose and the pictures—both in his book, and it soundeth much to the diminution of his deeds, that he alone is the herald to publish and proclaim them."

This description is witty, but false, and thus very characteristic of this writer. Fuller was noted for his want of accuracy, and especially was it shown in his "Worthies." The material was collected during the civil war, and the book published in 1662, after the author's death. One of the most learned men of that century was William Nicholson, Bishop of Carlisle, who published a "History of Libraries" in 1696. In it he says of Fuller's "Worthies," "It was huddled up in haste for the procurement of some moderate profit to the author, though he did not live to see it published. It corrects many mistakes in his Ecclesiastical Story, but makes more new ones in their stead. * * * His chief author is Bale for the lives of his eminent writers, and those of his greatest heroes are commonly misshapen scraps, mixed with tattle and lies." Alexander Chalmers in his Biographical Dictionary, considers this censure too great, but admits Fuller's inaccuracies, and speaks of his "wit, which he could not suppress in his most serious compositions."

The Rev. James Granger published a Biographical History of England in 1769. Chalmers testifies to its critical accuracy. The author describes Fuller thus, "He was unhappy in having a vein of wit, as he has taken uncommon pains to write up to the bad taste of his age, which was much fonder of conceit than sentiment."

We need not be surprised, therefore, at finding that Fuller sacrificed truth to wit in his sketch of Smith. That he has done so is apparent to any reader of the "Oxford Tract," which was compiled from the writings of eye-witnesses, and contains nearly every incident of Smith's life in Virginia.

The latest attack upon Smith is contained in a volume written by Charles Dudley Warner, Esq., and published during the year 1881, by Henry Holt & Company, of New York. We learn from the preface that the author was engaged to treat of his subject "with some familiarity and disregard of historic gravity." Accordingly we find the book is a labored effort to ridicule

Smith, and the author has succeeded in making a caricature of him.

But a single example need be given to show how utterly unreliable his picture of Smith is. At page 116, in quoting from the "General History" the account of the capture of Smith in the Chickahominy swamp by the Indians, the following is given: "Then finding the Captaine, as is said, that used the salvage that was his guide as his shield (three of them being slain and divers others so gauld), all the rest would not come neere him. Thinking thus to have returned to his boat, regarding them as he marched, more than his way, slipped up to the middle in an oosie creek, and his salvage with him, yet durst they not come to him till being neere dead with cold, he threw away his arms. Then according to their composition they drew him forth and led him to the fire where his men were slaine. Diligently they chafed his benumbed limbs. He demanding for their Captaine, they shewed him *Opechankanough*, King of Pamaunkee, to whom he gave a round Ivory double compass Dyall. Much they marvailed at the playing of the Fly and Needle, which they could see so plainly and yet not touch it because of the glass that covered them. But when he demonstrated by that Globe-like Jewell, the roundnesse of the earth and skies, the spheare of Sunne, Moone, and Starres and how the Sunne did chase the night round about the world continually: the greatnesse of the Land and Sea, the diversitie of nations, varietie of complexions, and how we were to them Antipodes, and many other such like matters, they all stood amazed with admiration."

It will be seen from this that Smith was using an Indian as a guide when he was captured. Of course he had learnt to converse with him. He had been in Virginia at that time nearly two years, and had been constantly mixing with the Indians and learning their language. In the "True Relation," quoted by the author at page 104, Smith states explicitly that he and his guide were "discoursing" when he was attacked. The reader will notice that the Indians had taken him out of the swamp and carried him to the fire he had left at his canoe, before he presented the compass to their chief and entered into conversation concerning it. Bearing this in mind, let us read Mr. Warner's comment on this passage. At pages 122–3 he writes: "We should like to think original in the above the fine passage, in which

Smith, by means of a simple compass dial, demonstrated the roundness of the earth and skies, the sphere of the sun, moon and stars, and how the sun did chase the night round about the world continually; the greatness of the land and sea, the diversity of nations, variety of complexions, and how we were to them antipodes, so that the Indians stood amazed with admiration. Captain Smith up to his middle in a Chickahominy Swamp, discoursing on these high themes to a Pamunky Indian, of whose language Smith was wholly ignorant, and who did not understand a word of English, is much more heroic, considering the adverse circumstances, and appeals more to the imagination than the long-haired Iopas singing the song of Atlas at the banquet given to Æneas when Trojans and Tyrians drained the flowing bumpers, while Dido drank long draughts of love. Did Smith, when he was in the neighborhood of Carthage, pick up some such literal translations of the song of Atlas as this:

> "He sang the wandering moon, and the labors of the Sun,
> From whence the race of men and flocks, whence rain and lightning,
> Of Arcturus, the rainy Hyades, and the twin Triones;
> Why the winter suns hasten so much to touch themselves in the ocean,
> And what delay retards the slow nights."

The misrepresentation contained in the statement, that Smith described himself as discoursing on these high themes while up to his middle in a swamp, with an Indian who could not understand a word of the language he used, is unpardonable. Equally groundless is the insinuation that the discourse never occurred, but was made up long afterwards from Smith's recollection of a passage in Virgil's Æneid. The same discourse is related in the "True Relation," written by Smith directly after his return from captivity, and claimed by Mr. Deane and others attacking Smith, to be the true account of the incidents of his captivity. If we are to look for the sources from whence he got his ideas thus conveyed, or pretended to be conveyed to the Indian chief, one would think that his lessons at school and his experience on land and sea were sufficient, without making him use a Latin poet, whom, in all probability, he never read, as he left school at an early age.

Examples of such strained efforts to ridicule Smith might be multiplied and taken from every part of the volume, but we need

not stop to expose them, as every reader will readily detect them. Mr. Warner has been constrained, however, to accord to Smith great merit for his accurate descriptions of Virginia and its inhabitants, and for his profound views and eminent services in regard to the colonization of North America. He represents him as admirable in many traits of character, yet false in what he says of himself. We think as he is sustained by others in matters of which they were cognisant, the conclusion is a safe one that he is truthful in those matters which rest on his own testimony alone.

But we need not pursue this branch of our subject further. The grounds of attack upon Smith, which have not been noticed, will be found even more conspicuously false than those we have been discussing.

Turning now to the direct evidence of the truthfulness of Smith as a writer, we shall find it ample and conclusive. We have seen that his "General History" of Virginia was first published in 1624. In 1629 he published, along with another edition, "The True Travels, Adventures and Observations of Captaine John Smith in Europe, Asia, Africke & America," and dedicated it to "William, Earle of Pembroke, Lord Steward of his Majestie's most Honorable Household, Robert, Earle of Lindsay, great Chamberlain of England, and Henrie, Lord Hunsdon, Viscount Rochford, Earle of Dover." He commences his dedication thus: "Sir Robert Cotton, that most learned treasurer of antiquitie, having by the perusal of my 'Generall Historie' and others, found that I had likewise undergone divers other hard hazards in other parts of the world, requested me to fix the whole course of my passages in a booke by itselfe, whose noble desire I could not but in part satisfie; the rather, because they have acted my fatal Tragedies on the stage, & racked my Relations at their pleasure." In conclusion he says he dedicated his work to these noblemen and expected them to patronize it, because they were "acquainted both with my [his] endeavors and writings." That this work received a favorable notice from them we learn from the dedication of a later work by Smith, called "Advertisements for the Unexperienced."

Sir Robert Cotton was the founder of the Cottonian Library, now a valuable part of the British Museum. He and the Earl of Pembroke were members of the Virginia Company, and had ample opportunities of knowing whether Smith's "General His-

tory" was truthful or not. Had they not been satisfied of his truthfulness they would hardly have allowed their names to be used in his dedication of his "True Travels," and such use of their names must be taken as their endorsement of the author.

The most remarkable adventures related in this last work are the killing of three Turks by Smith in single combat before the town of Regall, in Transilvania, and his subsequent escape from captivity in Tartary. These are attested by the patent of Sigismundus Bathor, Duke of Transilvania, given in full by Smith in his book, together with the certificate of its record in the office of the Herald of Arms at London. By this patent Smith was authorized to add three Turk's heads to his coat of arms. Grazebrook, in his "Heraldry of Smith," says he found Smith's Coat of Arms with the Turk's heads, which were confirmed to him by the College of Arms, in the British Museum. Harleian MS., No. 578. Burke, in his "Encyclopedia of Heraldry," describes it also. With such proof of the most remarkable incidents in his early life we need not look beyond Smith's own statement for evidence of the rest of this narrative. ✗

As this attack has grown out of Smith's statements in the "General History," however, we will look more particularly to the evidence of his truthfulness in that book.

We have seen that the "General History" embodied the "Oxford Tract," with some additions from the pen of Smith, and that this tract was carefully compiled out of the writings of the colonists, whose names are given by Dr. Symonds, and is a work of the highest authority. Now a comparison of this book with the "General History" shows that nearly every incident of Smith's stay in Virginia, given in the "History," is found in the "Tract." Certainly we find in it abundant evidence of "his perils, preservations, dangers, deliverances," which Fuller, through ignorance, or something worse, claimed were published and proclaimed alone by Smith.

The "Oxford Tract" relates, among other incidents, his being surprised by Opechankanough with two hundred men, while he only had fifteen, and his extrication of himself and his men by seizing the Indian King by his long lock and presenting a cocked pistol to his breast; his encounter, while alone, with the King of Paspahegh, "a most strong, stout salvage," which was only ended

✗ In Purchas' Pilgrimes an extract is given from a history of the wars of Sigismundus by Francisco Fiamese his Secretary, which relates the adventures of Smith while in his service including his combat with the Turks. Smith follows this account in his own hands.

by Smith's getting him into the river, and almost drowning him; and the plot of Powhatan to surprise him and murder his party, while away from Jamestown, which was prevented by Pocahontas, who, "by stealth in the darke night came through the wild woods and told him of it."

That the statements, added by Smith in his History, were true, is conclusively shown by the fact that the book was published in 1624, when many persons who had been with Smith in Virginia were alive, and some of them inimical to him, and we have no evidence that any one of his companions ever contradicted the statements in the book, while some of them directly testified to their truthfulness. The first edition contained tributes in verse, commending Smith and his book, written by twenty-one persons, and a later edition gives in addition similar tributes by twelve others. Of these thirty-three persons several were members of the London Company, and five were with Smith in Virginia, three arriving with the first supply, and two with the second, as appears by the published lists. One of the contributors, Edward Robinson, served under him in Transilvania, and was a witness to his adventures there.

Michael Phettiplace, William Phettiplace and Richard Wiffing, who came to Virginia with the first supply, united in their tribute. They recount the fact that they were with him in Virginia, and witnessed his prowess among the Indians. They say of him:

> "Who hast nought in thee counterfeit or slie."

and add

> "Who saith of thee, this savors of vaine-glorie,
> Mistakes both thee and us and this true storie."

Of the two who came with the second supply one, John Codrington, writes:

> "That which we call the subject of all storie,
> Is truth: which in this worke of thine gives glorie
> To all that thou hast done."

And the other, Raleigh Crashaw, speaking of the praise due to him, says:

> "For all good men's tongues shall keep the same."

Among the other contributors we find several of the most

noted men of the day. George Wither, distinguished as a poet, satirist and soldier, says:

> "Sir your relations, I have read, which show
> Ther's reason I should honour them and you."

R. Brathwait, an author of eminence, and John Donne, the celebrated poet, each contribute handsomely to the author's praise; but the tribute deserving of the most weight, perhaps, is that of the Rev. Samuel Purchas, the renowned collector of travels. He commences it thus:

> "Loe here Smith's Forge, where Forgery's Roague-branded,"

and continues at some length his quaint verses.

The character of Purchas is thus drawn by Boissard, who is followed by Chalmers and by the Encyclopædia Brittanica: "A man exquisitely skilled in languages, and all arts, divine and human; a very great philosopher, historian, and divine; a faithful presbyter of the Church of England, very famous for many excellent writings, especially for his vast volumes of the East and West Indies, written in his native tongue."

He resided in London, and was rector of St. Martin's, Ludgate, and chaplain to Abbott, Archbishop of Canterbury. Mr. Neill shows him to have enjoyed the confidence of the Virgina Company of London, and his works show him to have been an indefatigable collector of travels, and colonial histories. His great work, styled "Purchas, His Pilgrimes," was published in 1625, the year after Smith's "General History" appeared. In the 4th volume, at page 1705, he commences a history of Virginia, with this caption, "The proceedings of the English Colony in Virginia, taken faithfully out of the writing of Thomas Studley, cape-merchant, Anas Todkill, Doctor Russell, Nathaniel Powell, William Phetiplace and Richard Pot, Richard Wiffin, Tho. Abbay, Tho. Hope; and since enlarged out of the writings of Capt. John Smith, principall Agent and Patient in these Virginia occurrents, from the beginning of the plantation, 1606, till Ann. 1610, somewhat abridged." In a marginal note he says: "I have many written Treatises lying by me, written by Capt. Smith and others, some there, some here after their return; but because these have already seene the light, and containe a full relation of Virginian Affaires, I was loth to wearie the reader with others of

this time." At page 1773 he tells us he had the advantage of a perusal of Smith's "General History" in MS. while preparing his work. He also relates the visit of Rolfe and Pocahontas with Temocomo, "one of Powhatan's counsellours," to England in 1616, and states that he often conversed with this savage, and was favored by Rolfe with the loan of his work upon Virginia. He tells us of the honor and respect which were shown to Pocahontas, not only by the Company, but by many persons of honor, and particularly mentions the magnificent entertainment given her by Dr. King, Lord Bishop of London, at which he was present. With all of the advantages of living at the time of the transactions recorded by Smith, of mingling with the Company which colonized Virginia, of having before him the published and unpublished writings of the colonists, some of which are now lost, and of personally knowing so many of the most conspicuous characters which figure in the history of the colony, the testimony of this able and accurate writer should be conclusive as to Smith's "General History." Not only does he contribute verses commending Smith's work, but we find that in his own book he follows him closely, and gives the particulars of his rescue by Pocahontas as they are related in the "General History." It must have been that the acts of kindness shown by Pocahontas to the English in Virginia were topics of conversation while she was so conspicuous a person in London, as the correspondence of the day shows she was. Her rescue of Smith was either not known or was the subject of conversation. Purchas, who was intimate with Smith, and was in the society of Pocahontas and Rolfe, must have conversed with them about the matter, if it was known. If it was not then known, Purchas would have had his suspicions aroused when Smith afterwards put the incident in his "General History," and, as a careful historian, would have examined the evidences of the truth of the statement before he inserted it in his own book. In either event the fact that Purchas records the incident is the strongest evidence of its truth.

When we look to the writings of Smith himself for evidence of the truthfulness of his statement, in regard to the rescue, we find it ample to confirm our reliance on his veracity.

It is true that the garbled letter from Virginia, published in 1608, makes no mention of the matter, but it relates an incident

very suggestive of the truth of his subsequent statement. Soon after Smith was released from his captivity he determined to arrest some Indians who had been caught thieving in Jamestown. Powhatan was greatly concerned at the arrest, and sent several messengers to obtain their release; finally he sent Pocahontas, who is described as "a child of tenne years old," (she was probably twelve) and Smith delivered to her the prisoners. Why the cunning savage should have trusted his favorite child at such a tender age upon such an errand would be difficult to explain, unless we believe Smith's statement that she had previously saved his life.

In his other writings Smith frequently mentions his rescue, and in such a way as would have led to detection had he made a false statement about it.

In his "General History" he states, that upon the arrival of Pocahontas in England, in 1616, he, "to deserve her former courtesies, made her qualities knowne to the Queene's most excellent Majestie and her court, and writ a little booke to this effect to the Queene, an abstract whereof followeth." In this abstract he recounts his captivity amongst the Indians while in Virginia, and says: "After some six weeks fatting amongst these salvage courtiers, at the minute of my execution she hazarded the beating out of her owne braines to save mine, & not only that, but so prevailed with her father that I was safely conducted to Jamestowne." He then goes on to relate her coming to him afterwards in the night to apprise him of her father's plot to murder him and his men, her relief of the colonists from want, and her services in keeping peace between them and the Indians. He then adds these words: "Thus, most gracious Lady, I have related to your Majestie what at your best leasure our approved Histories will account you at large."

If this letter was written to the Queen under the circumstances, and at the time stated, we cannot doubt with any reason the truth of its statements. Every statement it contains, except that concerning his rescue, is supported by the writings of others in the "Oxford Tract," who were eye-witnesses. The rescue was only witnessed by the Indians; but an assertion of it in a letter to the Queen on behalf of Pocahontas, when she and her husband and her brother-in-law were in England, would not have been attempted if it had never happened.

Sir Thomas Dale brought them to England, and they were the guests of the London Company. Dale and the members of the Company were well informed of the incidents of Smith's life in Virginia, as he had been the most conspicuous man in the colony. Besides, some of the companions of Smith in Virginia had returned to England, and amongst them were several of his enemies. Had Smith for the first time related his rescue under such circumstances, or repeated a story which was untrue, it is impossible to believe that it would have passed without exposure. Nor can we discover any motive prompting Smith to so hazardous an undertaking as the utterance of such a falsehood. The other incidents in the life of Pocahontas, related in the letter and attested by the writings of others, were ample to commend her to the favorable notice of the Queen, and to gratify any vanity Smith might have had about connecting their names. No other motive has been suggested by those attacking him.

But the statement made in this letter that approved histories contained this with the other acts of kindness towards the English, performed by Pocahontas, proves that it was not then for the first time related by Smith. Doubtless the reference is to some of the writings mentioned by Purchas, which are now lost. It will not do to say now that no such statement was contained in histories then extant, when Smith openly stated that it was, and by publishing the letter in 1624 reiterated the statement without contradiction.

It is proper to note that what is given in the "General History," is stated to be an "abstract" of the letter, or "little book" which was sent to the Queen. It cannot be properly concluded, therefore, that the rescue was not more fully detailed in the letter than in the abstract, and all the effort which has been made to represent the account of the rescue as growing by repetition is without warrant.

The fact that Smith wrote this letter in 1616, if conceded, is conclusive of the rescue, and this was so apparent to Mr. Adams that he attempted to discredit Smith's statement concerning it. If the letter was written as claimed, the members of the court must have known of it, and when Smith published the statement in 1624, there were living many persons who had been members of the court of 1616. The Queen was dead, but the King was alive. There were also surviving, Prince Charles, who

named for Smith the localities he had discovered in New England; the celebrated Duchess of Richmond and Lenox, to whom the "General History" was dedicated; the Duchess of Bedford, lady to the Queen's bed chamber, an authoress and a patroness of literary men; the Duchess of Nottingham, lady to the Queen's drawing chamber, famous for her connection with the ring said to have been given by Elizabeth to the unfortunate Earl of Essex, who lost his head; and the Duchess of Suffolk, also of the drawing chamber, and mother of the notorious woman who was divorced from that Earl of Essex, who subsequently led the armies of Parliament against Charles the First.

These, and many others, would have at once detected the falsehood had Smith dared to publish in 1624 a letter purporting to have been written in 1616 to the Queen and her court, about so interesting a person as Pocahontas, which he had in fact never written. Purchas, too, who lived in London, and was intimate with Smith, must have known whether the statement was true, and, so far from any one denying it, he and others are found endorsing it, as well as the rest of the book.

The second reference to his rescue was made by Smith in 1622 in his book entitled "New England Trials." He had just heard of the massacre by the Indians in Virginia, and this led him to speak of his experience in the colony. Amongst other things he says: "Those two honorable Gentlemen, Captaine George Percie and Capt. Francis West, two of the Phitteplaces, and some other such noble Gentlemen and resolute spirits bore their shares with me, and, now living in England, did see me take this murdering Opechankanough, now their Great King, by the long lock on his head, with my pistol to his breast I led him amongst his greatest forces." Further on he adds: "It is true in our greatest extremity they shot me, slue three of my men, and by the folly of them that fled took me prisoner, yet God made Pocahontas, the King's Daughter, the meanes to deliver me." It thus appears that these companions of Smith were in England in 1622, and he named them as witnesses to certain actions of his in Virginia. These persons must have heard the particulars of Smith's captivity when they lived in Virginia, and they would have pronounced this statement in reference to the rescue false, if, indeed, it was false.

We learn from Mr. Neill's book that Rolfe died in 1622, the year this statement was published, and he may not have seen it in print, but we learn from the same author that his brother, Henry Rolfe, was living in England at the time, and was the guardian of the son of Pocahontas. He certainly would have informed himself of the matter, and denied the statement if he had found it untrue. The reference of Smith in the passage seems to be to a matter well known, and has every indication of truth about it, and it cannot be believed, without conclusive testimony, that he then for the first time, and falsely, put forth a claim that Pocahontas saved his life. It may be as well to state that in the verses of the Phettiplaces, printed with the "General History," and endorsing it, they particularly mention Smith's adventure with Opechankanough, which they witnessed.

The next reference we find is in Smith's letter to the commissioners appointed by the King in 1623, to inquire into the affairs of the Company. In this Smith says: "Six weekes I was led captive by those Barbarians, though some of my men were slaine, and the rest fled, yet it pleased God to make their great King's daughter the meanes to returne me safe to Jamestowne." Here again Smith would have been detected if he had related a falsehood, as the commissioners were directed to enquire into the affairs of the Company from the beginning, and they examined various persons who had been connected with it and knew its history.

The fourth statement as to his rescue is found in the "General History," where the detailed account is given heretofore quoted. When we remember that this book states that it was written at the instance of the Virginia Company of London, which statement was not contradicted by any one, so far as we know, but was confirmed by several members who commended the veracity of the author as regards his statements in the volume, we must look upon the book as published with the endorsation of the Company. The men who composed the Company were among the noblest and best in the kingdom, and had every opportunity of knowing whether Smith wrote the truth about their history. It is not credible that they would have permitted his work to go through so many editions without correcting what was known to be false. The fact, therefore, that Smith's book, so far from

being disowned by the members of the Company, was accepted as the standard history of the colony from its first appearance, is very strong evidence of its truthfulness.

The author was, in fact, a man of high character as well as genius. He was one of the persons selected by the Company to govern the infant colony of Virginia; he was entrusted with the charge of two expeditions to New England, and was appointed Admiral of that country. His maps of the countries he visited, and descriptions of their inhabitants, are acknowledged by all writers to be remarkably accurate, and the estimation in which he was held by those who knew him best, is admirably expressed by one of the writers in the "Oxford Tract" upon the occasion of his departure from the colony, in these words:

"What shall I saye, but thus we lost him; that in all his proceedings made justice his first guide, and experience his second, ever hating basenesse, sloth, pride and indignitie more than any dangers; that never allowed more for himselfe than for his soldiers with him; that upon no danger would send them where he would not lead them himselfe; that would never see us want what he either had or could by any means get us; that would rather want than borrow, or starve than not pay; that loved action more than wordes, and hated falsehood and coveteousnesse worse than death, whose adventures were our lives, and whose losse our deathes."

The London Company were prompted in sending out the colony by the desire of immediate gain, and when disappointed, threatened to abandon the colonists to their fate; and the hardships of colonial life made many desirous of abandoning the enterprise. But the far-reaching genius of Smith saw in the fertile soil and mild climate of Virginia, the provision by Providence for a great people, and he set himself resolutely to the work of bringing into subjection the native tribes,* and of

*The influence acquired by Smith over the Indians is thus described in "Purchas' Pilgrimage," edition 1614, p. 768: "Powhatan had above thirtie Commanders, or Wirrowances, under him, all of which were not in peace only, but serviceable, in Captaine Smith's presidencie, to the english, and still, as I

making the colony self-supporting. He rebuked the London Company for their threat to abandon the colony, he defeated the efforts to abandon the settlement at the risk of his life, he forced the men to labor, and he taught them how to hold the Indians in subjection, and to get from them needed provisions. In a word, he demonstrated the practicability of the enterprise.

Years afterwards, and when, through his exertions in a great measure, Virginia had been successfully planted, he pictured the miseries through which they had passed who planted it, and his entire devotion of himself to its interests in these words: "By that acquaintance I have with them, I call them my children, for they have been my wife, my hawks, hounds, my cards, my dice, and in totall, my best content, as indifferent to my heart as my left hand to my right. And notwithstanding all those miracles of disasters have crossed both them and me, yet were there not an Englishman remaining, as God be thanked, notwithstanding the massacre, there are some thousands, I would yet begin againe with as small meanes as I did at first."

As his companions freely accorded to him the honor of being the real founder of Virginia, now that his work has developed into such a power for the advancement of mankind, the world should freely accord him the great honor which is his due. His name, belittled by Fuller in its insertion among the "Worthies of England," should be enrolled among the "Worthies of Mankind," and he be forever assigned an honored place among the founders of great nations.

Mr. Neill, however, has not been content to aim at the destruction of Smith's character alone; he has also attempted to blacken the characters of Pocahontas and Rolfe. He has reproduced the description of the Indian princess at the age of eleven or twelve, given by Strachey, in which she is represented as a "well-featured but wanton young girle," playing with the boys in Jamestown. It may be a matter of doubt whether Mr. Neill meant by this to represent the innocent girl as unchaste, as we know others have done from this passage. He may have thought that his readers would know, what he did not note, that

---

have beene told by some that have since beene there, they doe affect him and will ask of him."

Strachey and his contemporaries used the word "wanton" in the sense of "playful."* But he has left us in no doubt that he would have us believe that before the marriage of Rolfe and Pocahontas they had been married to other persons, one of whom at least was then alive. He also expressly charges Rolfe with dishonest dealings with the estate of Lord Delaware. The testimony he adduces to sustain these charges will be found singularly inadequate.

The evidence relied on to show that Pocahontas was married before she married Rolfe, is a passage in Strachey's "Historie of Travaile into Virginia," at page 54, in which the author says, "They often reported unto us that Powhatan had then lyving twenty sonnes and ten daughters, besyde a young one by Winganuske, Machumps his sister, and a great darling of the King's; and besides, younge Pocohunta, a daughter of his, using sometyme to our fort in tymes past, nowe married to a private captaine called Kocoum, some two yeares since."

Strachey did not publish this work, but left two copies of a manuscript, from one of which, found in the British Museum, Mr. R. H. Major, in 1849, made the publication. At page 29, the author, speaking of the country north of James river, says it was "the place wherein our aboad & habitation now (well neere) 11 yeares consisted." The editor tells us in a note to this pas-

---

*"All wanton as a child, skipping and vain." Love's Labor Lost, v, 2.

"Like wanton boys, that swim on bladders." Henry VIII, iii, 2.

"As flies to wanton boys are we to the Gods
They kill us for their sport." King Lear, iv, 1.

"Quips and cranks and wanton wiles." L'Allegro.

At page 14, Strachey says the word Pocahontas signifies "little Wanton," showing it was a pet name.

A passage in the Oxford Tract, taken from the writings of Richard Pots, has been quoted by a late writer to cast a stigma upon Pocahontas. Pots is denying the charge that Smith ever intended to marry her and make himself King of Virginia. He says: "If he would he might have married her, or done what him listed, for there was none that could have hindered his determination." This plainly was meant to indicate the extent of Smith's power in Virginia, and not to indicate any want of virtue in Pocahontas, who could not have been over fourteen when he left the colony. The inscription on her portrait, in 1616, makes her then 21 years old.

sage, that in the manuscript the word, "six," was originally written, but had been crossed out and the figures 11 inserted in a darker colored ink. This shows that Strachey was from the year 1613 to the year 1618, or thereabouts, preparing this manuscript. The reference to the marriage of Pocahontas was evidently made when she was alive, and she died in March, 1617, in England. She was married to Rolfe in April, 1614, so that if this passage referring to her was written in the latter part of 1615, or 1616, it would have fitted in date that marriage.

We learn from the editor that the other copy of Strachey's manuscript, which is at Oxford, was dedicated to "Sir Allen Apsley, Purveyor to his Majestie's Navie Royall." Sir Allen was appointed to the higher office of Lieutenant of the Tower in 1616, as we learn from his daughter, in her memoir of Colonel Hutchinson, and afterwards it would have been proper to have added this higher title to his name. This makes it certain that the manuscript was completed during or before 1616.

The reliance to show that it was not Rolfe who was referred to as her husband, is in the use of the Indian name Kocoum. It will be seen that the text does not say that the husband was named Kocoum, but that he was a "private Captaine called Kocoum." In Smith's description of the Indians, (page 143, Richmond edition,) he says: "They have but few words in their language, and but few occasions to use any officers more than one commander, which commonly they call *Werowance*, or *Caucorouse*, which is captaine." Any one reading the authors we have been referring to, will be struck with the many ways in which they spell the same words, and especially Indian words,* not even observing the rule of *idem sonans*. It is very probable, therefore, that the word Kocoum is but a different spelling of Caucorouse, both meaning a captain, and referring to the position held by Rolfe at Jamestown as a captain of some section of the colonists, and therefore called a private captain. We have no information that the Indians had

* A single reference to Strachey will illustrate these various spellings of the same word. At page 56 he speaks "of Coiacohanauke, which we commonly (though corruptly) call Tapahanock, and is the same which Capt. Smith in his mappe calls Quiyoughcohanock," and "of the Weroance Pepiscummah, whome by construction, as well the Indians as we, call Pipisco."

any such officer except for war, who could not be called a private captain, while we find that the colony from its beginning was thrown into companies, having captains placed over them for civil government, which might well be called private captains. It is evident, therefore, that the word Kocoum might be the Indian designation of Rolfe, either from the office of private captain which he held, or otherwise; and that being the case, and it thus appearing that the author might have been, and probably was, referring to the marriage with Rolfe, in the absence of any other mention by him or by other writers of a marriage with any one else, we must conclude that the marriage with Rolfe was referred to. Had it not been so, when the author revised his manuscript after the arrival of Pocahontas in England as the wife of Rolfe, he would certainly have added to the passage the statement that she had subsequently married Rolfe. That the author revised this manuscript as late as 1618 is shown by the change of date we have noted, and by the fact that it is dedicated to "Sir Francis Bacon, Lord High Chancellor," and Bacon was not made chancellor till January, 1618.

The evidence relied on to show that Rolfe had another wife living at his marriage with Pocahontas, is a passage in a letter from Strachey, relating his shipwreck upon the island of Bermuda in 1610, on his way to Virginia. It is found at page 1746 of vol. iv. of Purchas' Pilgrims, and is as follows: "And the eleventh of February wee had the childe of John Rolfe christened, a daughter, to which Captaine Newport and myselfe were witnesses, and the aforesaid Mistris Horton, and we named it Bermuda." No mention is made of the mother of this child so as to show whether she was then alive, and no mention is made of her afterwards by this or by any other writer. Several years afterwards we find Rolfe publicly married at Jamestown to Pocahontas, with the consent of the acting Governor and of her father, and the service performed by a minister of high standing, and we are obliged to conclude that his first wife was then dead. The letter of Rolfe to Sir Thomas Dale, giving his reasons for his proposed marriage with Pocahontas is preserved by Hamor, and it shows Rolfe to have been an humble Christian, seeking Divine guidance as to the whole matter. His allusion to his condition in the following sentence shows plainly that he was unmarried: "Nor am I in so desperate an estate, that I regard not

what becommeth of mee; nor am I out of hope but one day to see my country, nor so void of friends nor mean of birth but there to obtain a mach to my great content."

It is not to be believed that Sir Thomas Dale, the acting Governor, and the Rev. Alexander Whitaker, the minister in the colony, should have approved of the marriage, as their letters printed by Purchas show, if either of the parties were married at the time. Both Dale and Whitaker state that Pocahontas had been baptized into the Christian faith before her marriage. Pocahontas and Rolfe were afterwards carried to England by Dale, as the guests of the London Company, and were received with favor at Court and into London society. Mr. Neill should bring direct and overwhelming proof to establish now that they were never lawfully married. His insinuations to the contrary will not be taken as proof, and can injure no one but himself.

At page 101 of his book, Mr. Neill heads a section with these words: "Rolfe suspected of unfair dealings," and he adds, "The minutes of the Company do not give a very high opinion of Rolfe's honesty." In proof he gives an entry of April 30, 1621, by which it appears that Lady Delaware requested, "that in consideration of her goods remayning in the hands of Mr. Rolfe, in Virginia, she might receive satisfaction for the same out of his tobacco now sent home." Mr. Neill himself gives other entries which show that the tobacco did not belong to Rolfe, and that Mr. Henry Rolfe was directed to acquaint her ladyship that his brother offered to make her, "good and faithfull account of all such goods as remayne in his hands, upon her ladyship's direction to that effect." Accordingly she desired "the court would grant her a commission dyrected to Sir Frances Wyatt, Mr. George Sandys and others, to examine and certifie what goods and money of her late husband's deceased, came to the hands of Mr. Rolfe, * * * and to require the attendinge to his promise that she may be satisfied." This seems to have been the usual way that estates in Virginia were appraised and settled at that time, when, for the lack of probate courts in the colony, the Company in London regulated such matters.

Nothing more is given by Mr. Neill from any source as to the settlement of Lord Delaware's estate, and we must conclude that Rolfe fully accounted for it so soon as his accounts were lawfully settled and he could get a legal discharge.

It is upon such a flimsy pretext as this that Mr. Neill attempts to fix the charge of dishonesty on Rolfe, who is represented by the Rev. Alex. Whitaker, and other writers of the time, as a man of high character and of great usefulness in the colony. It is worthy of note that he was the pioneer in the culture of Virginia's great staple, tobacco, and one of the most active in developing the various resources of the country. He will be ever remembered in history, however, as the husband of Pocahontas, who, born the daughter of a savage King, was endowed with all the graces of character which become a Christian princess; who was the first of her people to embrace Christianity, and to unite in marriage with the English race; who, like a guardian angel, watched over and preserved the infant colony which has developed into a great people, among whom her own descendants have ever been conspicuous for true nobility; and whose name will be honored while this great people occupy the land upon which she so signally aided in establishing them.

Pamphlet
Binder
Gaylord Bros.
Makers
Syracuse, N. Y.
PAT. JAN 21, 1908

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA
3 0112 126331070